

of Wisconsin-Milwaukee Archives Department for providing me with access to relevant archival materials; Brad Miles for his assistance with archival research in Milwaukee; Cal Lee and Nancy McGovern for their contributions to and reflections on chronologies of relevant events that draw heavily upon their own pioneering work with electronic records; Kimberly Anderson for helping with the collation of relevant media materials; Marcia Bates; Michael Buckland, Jonathan Furner, Peter Hirtle, Luiz Mendes, Joshua Sternfeld, and Kelvin White for their input and careful readings of various drafts of this manuscript; and especially Eunha Youn, not only for her invaluable assistance in gathering bibliographic materials for this book, but for her patient and scrupulous reading and rereading of, and many insightful suggestions about, multiple versions of the manuscript.

Finally, I would like to thank Peter Wosh and Teresa Brinati of the Society of American Archivists for their immensely patient encouragement and support during the writing and publication of this book.

*Anne Gilliland
Los Angeles, October 2012*

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

This chapter introduces the book's scope and main themes. It reviews the components of the traditional archival paradigm and identifies several constructs emerging from technological developments, intellectual and community movements, and archival scholarship that expand and challenge the paradigm to move beyond physically bound thinking and to become more inclusive of multiple ways of knowing and practicing.

The Archival Role in Digital Timespace

Places, people, and cultures geographically distant from us have become evermore present in our lives through technological advancements. Over the past two centuries, first locomotives, automobiles, and airplanes made rapid travel across long distances possible for migration and emigration, business, curiosity, and pleasure. Then rockets and satellites awed and inspired us with their capacity to gaze at the earth and its neighbors from outside our own atmosphere and to place the earth within its astronomical and cosmological contexts. Local and remote communities became better informed about each other and more interactive by means of the telegraph, telephone, and television. Governing and doing business, as well as remembering, voicing, capturing, storing, and disseminating personal and community experiences within and across generations and geography were augmented dramatically when visual and audio recording technologies, and then electronic mail, cellular telephones, the Internet, and the cloud entered everyday life. The Web revolutionized citizen interaction with government and citizen access to public records, fundamentally altering

citizen relationships with the state. At the same time, however, the amount of data gathered and maintained by governments and for-profit organizations on individual citizens is at an all-time high. Our perceptions of time and events have also progressively morphed. Work, learning, sports, leisure activities, and, indeed, our daily routines, have become more granular and precise with the adoption first of the pocket-, then the wristwatch, and finally the split-second clock. Even the finality of death seems to have been affected as we contemplate the digital afterlives of our Facebook pages and Twitter accounts. We are left with a world simultaneously more fragmented and more integrated, a world bigger and more diverse and yet smaller, a world where control over how and when information is created and used has been democratized and yet those information patterns are increasingly exploited or under surveillance.

These developments fundamentally change how we conduct our lives, how we relate to other people and places, how we become informed, and how we conceive of the passing of time, of past events, and of the very act of remembering. They have become so transparent and embedded that it is hard to remember that the majority occurred only across the course of six or seven generations and that pervasive digitality supported by developments such as the World Wide Web, high-speed IP data networks and mobile broadband, and the cloud emerged only in the last twenty years. Today's digital technologies transcend the limitations of space, refashion the parameters of time, and blur boundaries not only between official and personal, public and private, corporate and public domains, but also between material and nonmaterial. They make possible not only physical, but virtual societies and communities; support collaborative work practices; optimize digital capacity; and spawn innovative genres and altered literacies. As events during the "Arab Spring" that began in 2010 illustrate only too well, digital technologies can play an important role in supporting democratization and liberation in the present, as well as in rescuing, reconciling, and repatriating the legacy and knowledge of the past. All the while, changes in modes of creation and transmission can alter the resulting form, nature, and capacity of the record. They can also generate new forms of societal documentation—the digital residue of our lived lives—that capture complex, diverse, and distributed; often sensitive; and sometimes

highly personal aspects of our existence, much of which in the past was absent from the official records and even from collections of personal papers that filled the world's archives. The personal is increasingly inextricably embedded in the official record, and the private in the public.

Archives are a critical component of how many societies remember, are held accountable, and generally conduct their affairs. They are ancient entities. Although they have taken on many forms, archives have always been concerned with the human record and how it can bridge time and space and remain meaningful and useful. Many fields and institutions view themselves as integrally associated with information, memory, and evidence in one form or another. However, among them, the recordkeeping professions—archival science and records management—are, first and foremost, the professions of the record. Archives are predicated on an understanding of the power of the record in bureaucratic, societal, community, and individual lives. Over time, they have played key roles as trusted witnesses and correctives to the records and narratives of events, actions, communities, and lives. They have also, however, been complicit in the promulgation and preservation of centralized power and control, and the perpetuation of official narratives that silenced, ignored, or misrepresented countless other perspectives and experiences. They are, in the words of law and commerce scholar Doris Long, both the "sword and the shield," not only for governments and other big institutions, but also for cultures, communities, and individuals.¹ At the same time, archives and the professions of the record have themselves evolved. Canadian archival scholar Terry Cook suggests that over the past 150 years, the archival identity has been shifting across four different frameworks or mindsets: juridical legacy, cultural memory, societal engagement, and community archiving. He sees these as being cumulative rather than completely replacing each other. As a result, he argues, the archivist "has been transformed . . . from passive curator to active appraiser to societal mediator to community facilitator. The focus of archival thinking has moved from evidence to memory to identity and community, as the broader intellectual currents have changed from pre-modern to modern to postmodern to contemporary."² Chinese scholars Xiaomi An and Wang Wang, who have been engaged in developing metasynthetic approaches to records and knowledge management

in business and government settings, posit that there are five levels of consciousness at work today: egocentric, ethnocentric, sociocentric, world centric, and planet- or cosmocentric.³ The archival ideas, practices, and research discussed throughout this book support Cook's argument that archival thinking has evolved and grown increasingly complex. They also evidence that multiple different mindsets or consciousnesses are indeed at work today, sometimes interactively and sometimes independently.

Thinking and Acting "Glocally"

The twenty-first century is synonymous in many people's minds with the digital age, an era when digitally empowered change has tremendous implications for archives and recordkeeping—how we secure rights and responsibilities; develop individual and collective senses of the present and of posterity; and inscribe, analyze, preserve, make accessible, and repurpose the data, records, artifacts, and other aspects of cultural heritage that comprise our societal memory. As if this were not sufficient food for thought as the archival field contemplates its role and its future in this century, the digital age has also been a prime facilitator of another critical shift toward *glocalization*. Sociologist Roland Robertson famously defined glocalization in 1997 as "the simultaneity—the co-presence—of both universalizing and particularizing tendencies."⁴ In other words, while national, sector, and institutional interests and perspectives often set the agenda in the past, today the focus on simultaneously addressing local and global needs and perspectives, as well as on understanding the effects of interaction between the two, is growing. Archives should be concerned about glocalization for several pressing reasons. Indigenous, local, and colonial recordkeeping and memory systems and practices that developed out of particular national and cultural traditions and worldviews are simultaneously grappling with their tangled and often still traumatic colonial legacy, and interfacing and negotiating with other traditions and worldviews in whole new digital ways. New and reconstituted nations are working to develop their national identities and strengthen their own bureaucratic, scholarly, and professional infrastructures internally, while seeking visibility and recognition on the world stage. In devising standards, best practices, regulations, and

terminology for international implementation, developers need to consider that recordkeeping can take place and data can be exchanged effectively and equitably across national, cultural, linguistic, and ideological boundaries, as well as among different technological environments. Major archival traditions, while necessarily evolving to address digital considerations, nevertheless remain rooted in specific national, legal, political, cultural, and historical contexts and assumptions. Furthermore, not every national recordkeeping tradition has historically been represented during the processes associated with creating international standards, best practices, regulations, and terminology. For example, even with opportunities for wider professional commentary, international records management and archival description standards remain strongly rooted in certain European, North American, and Australian conceptualizations. Asian epistemologies, Indigenous protocols for working with archival materials, as well as the blossoming community archives movement empowering ethnic, racial, and grassroots communities often on the margins of mainstream institutional archival activity, further challenge these traditions. These challenges require the archival field to take local cultural and community practices and ontologies into account, to engage in participative and consultative approaches, and to contemplate the very real possibility that some community archives will not have the necessary resources to implement or comply with standards and best practices, or may decide not to implement them for philosophical, political, or other reasons.

At the same time, little is new about progressive technological change, per se. It is easy to forget the accelerating number of transformations in recording and communications technologies as well as the multiple and shifting epistemologies with which archives have had to cope over the past three or more millennia. In this sense, the digital age is but one more era in the archival temporal continuum. The perpetual challenge for archives has been to respond in thoughtful and constructive ways to new developments and to address those yet to come. Such responses require of archivists and archives today a glocal orientation and a careful balancing of continuity with innovation, of responsibility with responsibilities, and of reflexivity with principled rigor.

The Evolving Archival Paradigm

As chapter 2 discusses in more detail, discourses not only within the archival profession but also within information technology and management communities and disciplinary scholarship locate the archival role in varying places along a spectrum that ranges from bureaucratic practice to cultural heritage to identity construction to human rights concerns, with all shades in between. These discourses tend to take on their own trajectories, often passing each other by with only nominal nods, rather than pausing to contemplate what kinds of cross-formations might be possible or useful in understanding and advancing archives and their roles in an increasingly technologized and glocal society. A little over a decade ago, I authored a report for the Council on Library and Information Resources titled *Enduring Paradigms, New Opportunities: The Value of the Archival Perspective in the Digital Environment*, arguing that the various paradigms that historically guided each of the information professions come up short when compared with the scope of the issues continuously emerging in the digital environment. Instead, an overarching dynamic paradigm—that adopts, adapts, develops, and sheds principles and practices of the constituent information communities as necessary—needs to be created. Such a paradigm may possibly be taking shape through recent work in digital and data curation.

First defined by American physicist and philosopher of science Thomas Kuhn, a *paradigm* is a formal model or pattern of beliefs, outlooks, assertions, values, and practices regarding a particular activity or phenomenon.⁶ The archival paradigm (or paradigms, if one views the different frameworks and traditions within which archivists have operated as distinct paradigms rather than as different manifestations and phases of a unifying paradigm) with which this book is primarily concerned first took shape in a series of regulations and manuals published in France, Prussia, the Netherlands, Spain, Italy, and elsewhere in Western Europe in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Emanating chiefly out of the experiences of those working principally in archives holding state and municipal records, it supports an evidence-based approach to the management of those records. It is fundamentally concerned with the organizational and individual functions,

processes, and contexts through which records and knowledge are created and preserved as well as the ways in which records individually and collectively reflect those functions, processes, and contexts in and over time. The paradigm operates on multiple conceptual, functional, and professional levels as a framework for archival theorizing as well as for archival practice. In this framework, theory develops out of practice (inductive) and practice develops out of theory (deductive). It represents both a particular perspective on information and knowledge management and a distinctive professional ethos. Table 1.1 outlines several of the traditional and emergent components of the paradigm.⁷

Table 1.1. Components of the archival paradigm

Component	Examples
Core concepts (interdependent)	Record, recordkeeping, archives, evidentiality, transactionality, accountability, memory, identity
Subconcepts and ancillary concepts (interrelated)	Authority, creatorship, document, original/copy, power, reliability/authenticity
Canonical precepts	<i>Respect des fonds</i> and the principle of provenance (keeping materials generated by the same organization, person, or activity together and not intermixing them with materials of a different provenance), the sanctity of original order, the notion of hierarchy in records
Characteristics inherent in records due to the circumstances of their creation	Naturalness, organic nature or interrelationship, impartiality, authenticity, uniqueness
Constituent parts of records	Documentary form (intrinsic and extrinsic elements), annotations, context, and medium; digital bitstream
Records and recordkeeping models	The records life cycle, the records continuum model, the Open Archival Information System (OAIS) Reference Model
Emergent constructs	The archival multiverse, archival reconciliation, archivalization, co-creatorship, community archives, digital components, functional requirements for recordkeeping, living archives, postcustodialism, risk management
Recordkeeping contexts	Juridical-administrative, provenancial, procedural, documentary, technological, historical, sociocultural
Recordkeeping mandates	Laws, regulations, standards, best practices, institutional mission
Recordkeeping processes	Records creation, capture, organization, disposition, pluralization

Archival professional practices	Appraisal, preservation, collective and hierarchical arrangement and description, dissemination of records, outreach
Professional ethics and values statements	Society of American Archivists <i>Core Values Statement and Code of Ethics</i> , International Council on Archives <i>Code of Ethics</i>

In *Enduring Paradigms*, I argued that the traditional paradigm, and especially archival ideas about provenance, authenticity, collective description, and preservation, offers powerful approaches for grappling with problems of volume, heterogeneity, trustworthiness, and persistence that dog the entire world of information preservation, description, retrieval, and use.

Kuhn argues, however, that paradigms undergo periodic shifts, such as the shifts and phases identified by Cook, and that these shifts open up new ways of thinking within a field.⁸ While this book argues for the continuing relevance of fundamental paradigmatic ideas to the twenty-first-century archival field as well as to areas of information and knowledge management that have emerged or grown over the past decade, therefore, it is also concerned with each of Cook's paradigmatic phases and the ways in which the different approaches they represent continue to interact, spurred on by technological developments and the missions of the organizations and initiatives under which archivists operate. This book delves more deeply and critically into the history of how the archival paradigm took on its distinctive shape in American archival practice and thought. It also examines how the paradigm has evolved over the past century and needs to continue to evolve in response to technical and sociopolitical movements, to international developments and collaborations in the field, and now to the forces of globalization.

In 1994, Australian archival scholar Sue McKemmish observed that

The loss of physicality that occurs when records are captured electronically is forcing archivists to reassess basic understandings about the nature of the records of social and organisational activity, and their qualities as evidence. Even when they are captured in a medium that can be felt and touched, records as conceptual constructs do not coincide with records as physical objects. Physical ordering and placement of such records captures a view of their contextual and documentary relationships, but cannot present multiple views of what is a complex reality. The traditional custodial role takes

on another dimension when it is accepted that the record is only partly manifest in what is in the boxes on the repository shelves.⁹

A recurring theme in the chapters that make up this book is the debate over the nature of some key archival concepts, principles, and practices in a postphysical, postcustodial, and postmodern world. This discourse does not call for abandoning archival ideas, even though the continuing relevance and viability of particular archival and recordkeeping practices such as records retention scheduling and appraisal have been challenged. It does, however, point up the need for the conceptualization of those ideas to become simultaneously more expansive and more rigorous to encompass and address wider social, geopolitical, technological, and ontological realities. While research in practice is slowly increasing, the theory building of key individuals such as Cook, Upward, and McKemmish and the findings of prominent research collaborations that bridge sectors and disciplines drive much of the discourse. At the same time, ideas and methods emanating out of scholarship in other fields influences this research. As Figure 1.1 indicates, the past twenty-five years witnessed unprecedented growth, diversification, and increasing complexity in archival research. Although some of the highest profile research resulted from the prioritization of electronic records concerns in national funding agendas and by major government archives, the growing size and scope of graduate archival education and the expanding cohorts of faculty opened up more areas of research and encouraged more research in practice. Notable growth in the published research literature parallels this expansion, not only in professional journals and reports, but also in research journals, conference proceedings, and monographs.¹⁰ Couture and Ducharme analyzed forty articles from five North American and international archival professional journals between 1988 and 1998 to identify major research themes.¹¹ Figure 1.1 juxtaposes Couture and Ducharme's findings with a review conducted by Gilliland and McKemmish of recent thematic trends in archival scholarship based upon research presented by participants at the 2009 through 2011 annual meetings of the Archival Education and Research Institute (AERI), currently the largest international forum for archival researchers, educators, and doctoral students.¹²

Research topics, 1988–1998 (Couture and Ducharme, 1998)	Research topics, 2008–2012 (Gilliland and McKemmish, 2013)
- Archives and archival science—the nature of the Archive, archival goals, and the usefulness of archives - Archives and society—the role and place of archives, archival science and the profession - Archival issues—ethics, access, privacy - Archival functions - History of archives and archival science - Management of archival programs and services - Technologies - Types of media and archives; electronic records - Types of archival institutions	- Anthropological data collection and repatriation - Archaeological recordkeeping - Archival description and recordkeeping metadata - Archival education, training, and pedagogy - Archival implications of social media - Archives and human rights - Archives and postcoloniality - Arts and performing arts archives - Business records and recordkeeping - Community recordkeeping practices - Community-based archives and community-centric archival policy - Criminal justice, counterterrorism and recordkeeping - Decolonization of the Archive - Diasporic and expatriate records and identity concerns - Digital curation - Digital forensics - Digital heritage convergences - Digital humanities convergences - Digitization and associated policy concerns, e.g., copyright - Electronic recordkeeping systems and approaches - Evidence studies - Globalization and other global concerns - Health records and recordkeeping - History of archives and archival practices - Indigenous knowledge, culture and the Archive - Legislative analysis - Memory and identity studies - Metadata modeling - Moving image archives (analog and digital) - Museum archives - Personal recordkeeping and digital archives - Scientific recordkeeping and data archives - Social justice, human rights, truth and reconciliation commissions - The social life of records and documents - Transformative research by and with Indigenous and other communities partners - Trusted digital repositories

Figure 1.1. Expansion of the scope of archival research in the twenty-first century

Some Resonating Emergent Constructs

Within this discourse, several convergent constructs relate to sometimes intersecting, sometimes competing ideas, models, frameworks, and imperatives. Because they emanate out of different archival, juridical, and intellectual traditions, it is often possible to identify certain constructs, movements, and initiatives with specific geographic regions, as well as with particular individuals or formative collaborations between individuals. Figure 1.2 lists some of the key contributions over the past fifty years, as well as prominent associated individuals and organizations. Unfortunately, it is not yet possible to fully acknowledge or integrate similar contributions

USA AERI (Gilliland, Yakel) Archives and museum informatics (Bearman) BitCurator (Lee, Woods, Kirschenbaum) Community archives (Bastian, Alexander) DICE Group (Moore, Marciano, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill) DigCCurr (Tibbo, Lee) EAD (Pitti, SAA) Electronic Records Research Agenda (NHPRC) The Internet Archive (Kahle, Prelinger) MARC AMC/APPIM (Hensen, SAA, RLIN) OAIS (CCSDS) Pittsburgh Project (Cox, Bearman, Duff)	Europe Collective memory and archives (Ketelaar) DLM Forum Erpanet EU Framework Programme MoReq
Canada Contemporary archival informatics (Duranti, MacNeil) InterPARES (Duranti) Macroappraisal (Cook) Postmodern constructions of archives (Cook) RAD (BCA, CCA) Total archives (Smith)	Australia Archival reconciliation (McKemmish, Faulkhead, Russell) Australian Series System (Scott) AS4390-1996 CRKM (Monash University, NAA, SR NSW, ASA CDS, McKemmish, Gilliland, Cunningham) Continuum thinking (Scott, Upward, McKemmish, Reed, Hurley) RKMS (McKemmish, Acland, Cumming, Reed, Ward) Relationships in records/simultaneous multiple and parallel provenance (Hurley) VERS (PROV)
U.K. CAMiLEON (Hedstrom, Rusbridge, Wheatley) CEDARS (CURL, Universities of Cambridge, Leeds, and Oxford) Community archives (Flinn, Stevens, Shepherd) DCC JISC	China Metasynthetic strategies for recordkeeping (Feng, An, Liu, Wang)
	South Africa Archives, justice, and reconciliation (Harris)

Figure 1.2. Some key contributions to evolving archival ideas, practices, standards, and technologies by region

to archival thought and practice that occur in other regions due to inadequate mechanisms for exchanging information across the global archival community, for example, robust programs for translating scholarly and professional literature, terminology, and semantics, and support for professional and scholarly exchanges.

These contributions and the strands of discourse that surround them indicate a growing intellectual and practical complexity of the status, role, and practices of archives in society. They interweave theoretical models of recordkeeping, discussions about the nature and import of archival concepts and practices in a "post-" world fraught with contemporary global challenges, and contemplation of how new technological capabilities open up new possibilities and new ways of thinking about them.¹³ To prepare readers for discussions in the following chapters, I outlined some emergent constructs central to discussions about the potential nature and roles of the twenty-first century.

Archives as a Place and Post-custodial Approaches

The construct of archives as physical places of custody that can be trusted to protect the evidence value of the records they hold and to maintain a professional neutrality in the face of how and why those records were created or could be used lies at the heart of the modern archival paradigm. As already mentioned, that paradigm had its roots in European practices. Luciana Duranti eloquently uses historical warrant to demonstrate how, from Roman times onward, archives occupied physical places that take custody of bureaucratic documents, transforming them as they cross the archival threshold into "testimony of past actions."¹⁴ She argues that the preservation of that testimony and the evidence it implies is endangered once it is no longer in active use unless it is physically removed from its creators and those with a direct interest in its content and transferred across the archival threshold into archival custody.¹⁵ However, archivists working with born-digital materials are only too aware today of how technological complexities, policy concerns, and economic costs may result in those materials never being physically stored within a physical archives. Instead, they might remain with their original creator, be placed together

with nonarchival materials within an institutional or other digital repository, or stored remotely in the cloud.

One of the first major challenges to the traditional custodial paradigm came in 1981. F. Gerald Ham, in a plenary address to the annual meeting of the Society of American Archivists, argued that archivists had entered the "post-custodial era," when "the revolution in information processing" was resulting in an unprecedented abundance of hard-to-preserve records. This abundance, he asserted, was forcing archivists out of their introspective proclivities and excessive proprietaryness toward their holdings and into a more active role in which they "must make crucial decisions—or decide by not deciding—about the future of the historical record."¹⁶ In other words, archivists could no longer conduct themselves as passive recipients and custodians of old, but still valuable, records. Instead, they would need to be proactive. In the same speech, Ham noted several other ways in which this revolution challenged traditional archival ideas—how databases compiled from multiple sources confound the notion of aggregations of records with a single provenance; and how the mutability of materials created and maintained electronically renders the principle of retaining records according to their original order irrelevant, challenges the uniqueness of records that could so easily be reproduced, makes it difficult to distinguish between an original and a copy, and raises new questions about how to ensure that records are not altered in any way. He argued that, as a result, archivists would need to rethink what would constitute appropriate archival "processing" when working with these materials.

Ham set out a five-point agenda for how archivists should proceed in the post-custodial era. First, they should develop coherent and comprehensive programs for acquiring archival materials locally, regionally, and nationally. Second, they should focus on providing easy and centralized access to materials becoming increasingly complex and dispersed. Third, they should address the ways in which materials are created by information technology and devise how to appraise and preserve them for future use. Fourth, they must become involved in resolving the conflicts between freedom of information and privacy in terms of how these affect the quality and content of the archival record and access to it. Fifth, they should make better use of available national resources for archival activity. In

1992, Australian archivist Glenda Acland was particularly emphatic in her support for a post-custodial perspective:

A change in the traditionally perceived archival mindset is needed here to manage the records and their continuum, not the relics at the end stage in the record life cycle. . . . With the spotlight clearly on the record rather than the relic, the equilibrium can be adjusted to provide efficient, effective and innovative public record management with an intellectual control not custody axis, safeguarding and making accessible archival resources for good government, public accountability and future research needs.¹⁷

In 1996, fellow Australians Frank Upward and Sue McKemmish, influenced by, among others, the work of sociologist Anthony Giddens and archives and museum informaticist David Bearman,¹⁸ brainstormed a set of “structural principles” for recordkeeping in a late modern society that add a more conceptual approach to Ham’s agenda:

1. A concept of “records” which is inclusive of records of continuing value (= archives), which stresses their uses for transactional, evidentiary and memory purposes, and which unifies approaches to archiving/recordkeeping whether records are kept for a split second or a millennium.
2. A focus on records as logical rather than physical entities, regardless of whether they are in paper or electronic form.
3. Institutionalization of the recordkeeping profession’s role requires a particular emphasis on the need to integrate recordkeeping into business and societal processes and purposes.
4. Archival science is the foundation for organising knowledge about recordkeeping. However, this knowledge should be combined with relevant knowledge and skills from other fields.¹⁹

Much from these agendas has been taken up in a variety of different ways in the past thirty years, both nationally and internationally, as the chapters in this book demonstrate, although many archivists still fail to understand that what is called for here is a conceptual shift in how records are thought of, regardless of the media in which they present themselves. They do, however, recognize that it may be technologically, politically, and economically impractical, unsound, or even impossible to

physically acquire, preserve, and provide access to the massive volume of digital materials being generated by organizations and individuals today. Archival theorists and institutions alike have built on the notion of post-custodialism with arguments and programs that view centralized archives as “an archives of last resort.”²⁰ Upward, however, cautions that “post-custodial approaches to archives and records cannot be understood if they are treated as a dualism. They are not the opposite of custody. They are a response to opportunities for asserting the role of an archives—and not just its authentication role—in many re-invigorating ways.”²¹

Archivists are increasingly encouraged and professionally educated to become actively engaged with the management and intellectual aspects of the keeping of records. Examples of this engagement include articulating functional requirements for recordkeeping systems design, devising and implementing policies for the appropriate management of active records and archives stored by third-party vendors, undertaking business process analyses to understand where records are or should be created, brokering user access to materials of archival value such as large-scale databases that remain in the custody of the original creator, and developing automated ways to validate permitted users as well as to provide online users with customized digital information in response to their queries.²²

Notwithstanding all these developments, bricks-and-mortar archives endure, at least for the moment, as the primary repositories for preserving records. More importantly, perhaps, mainstream archival practices remain profoundly physically oriented. If they are to transition into a more thoroughly digital conceptualization and set of functions, archives will need a clear sense of which characteristics of the physical archives ensure and demonstrate security and trustworthiness and how they achieve those characteristics. Their efficacy needs to be rigorously evaluated, and then the functionality of those characteristics of demonstrated continuing value must be translated and operationalized for the digital environment.

Some digital proponents argue that the physical orientation of archives might only be sustainable for a handful of years, at which point everything worth keeping will either be born digital or digitized. While such statements inevitably raise critical questions about what functions and capabilities might be omitted or lost if this were indeed to be the case,²³

unquestionably it is time for the archival field to move beyond its physical orientation not only to remain relevant and viable in the digital age, but also to take on new functions associated with shifts in the archival paradigm and to take advantage of new capabilities associated with changes in information technology and knowledge development.

Archivization and Archivalization

The constructs of *archivization* and *archivalization* were not part of the traditional archival paradigm. Rather, they are critical constructs that emerged out of shifting intellectual approaches in the arts and humanities, enhancing the reflexivity of professional archival thought. In 1995, French philosopher Jacques Derrida argued that "the technical structure of the archiving archive also determines the structure of the archivable content even in its very coming into existence and in its relationship to the future . . . the archivization produces as much as it records the event."²⁴ Influenced by Derrida, Foucault, and a growing number of postmodern and postcolonial scholars, several prominent archival thinkers have in recent years called the field's attention to the many historical ways in which archives have been active agents in shaping their future holdings and thereby, public perceptions about historical events.²⁵ Coining a related term, *archivalization*, Eric Ketelaar discusses "the conscious or unconscious choice (determined by social and cultural factors) to consider something worth archiving . . . influenced by social, religious, cultural, political and economic contexts."²⁶

Bearing in mind Ham's agenda for post-custodial archives and the kinds of activities that post-custodial archivists have begun to take on, such critiques invoke important questions about whether it is possible to undertake such roles and activities without increasing the archivization and archivalization effects. While these questions certainly have philosophical and theoretical dimensions, the same critical scrutiny needs to become embedded in archival practice, continuously analyzing how archivists approach their work, the degree of reflexivity archivists evidence about that work, and the impact of the work on archival inclusivity and pluralization that a global orientation demands.²⁷

Communities of Memory and of Records

The past decade also saw increasing interest on the part of scholars in archival studies in the relationships between memory and communities, and records and archives. Some of this emanates out of the influence of postmodernism and postcolonialism upon archival thought, but it also overlaps considerably with human rights considerations relating to records and recordkeeping in diverse contexts around the world.²⁸ It is useful to juxtapose several recent statements by archival scholars that point to different aspects of these relationships. Drawing upon the work of political scientist James Booth on the concept of a community of memory,²⁹ Ketelaar writes:

Collective identity is based on the elective processes of memory, so that a given group recognises itself through its memory of a common past. A community is a "community of memory." That common past is not merely genealogical or traditional, something which you can take or leave. It is more: a moral imperative for one's belonging to a community. The common past, sustained through time into the present, is what gives continuity, cohesion and coherence to a community. To be a community, a family, a religious community, a profession involves an embeddedness in its past and, consequently, in the memory texts through which that past is mediated.³⁰

McKemmish, Gilliland, and Ketelaar further discuss the archival implications of this assertion:

Societies institutionalise their collective archives according to their own evidence and memory paradigms. These paradigms influence what is remembered and what is forgotten, what is preserved and what is destroyed, how archival knowledge is defined, what forms archives take, how archives are described and indexed, and who has ownership, custodial and access rights relating to them. They also shape archival notions of reliability, authenticity, and trustworthiness. . . . Available technologies and prevailing literacies also play a formative role in shaping the archives and the formation of collective memory.³¹

In a similar vein, Jeannette Bastian coined the term "community of records" when discussing her research in the Virgin Islands. She writes:

The effect of the loss of access to their archives on the ability of the Virgin Islands' people to write their own history and construct their collective memory. . . . In a wider sense, this story of colonial memory also concentrates our attention on the general relationships between records and the communities that create them, between

records and memory and between memory and access. . . . It suggests that, in order to use records as reliable indicators of an entire society, both the subjects as well as the creators of the records must be seen as active participants in a process in which record creating is defined as much by place, people, and community as it is by the act of creation itself.³²

These statements emanate out of the authors' research with regard to particular historical or cultural communities but prompt the reader to consider how the characterizations associated with communities of memory and/or records might transfer into digital environments such as social media sites or digital community archives.

Community Archives

Community archives have received increasing attention from both archival scholars and working archivists over the past decade, especially in the United States, the United Kingdom, and Canada.³³ The increasing prominence and prevalence of community archives, as well as the attention they receive from archival repositories and scholars, resulted in the ad hoc designation of this as the "Community Archives Movement." The United States, the United Kingdom, and Canada all project strong national identities but also have substantial or key populations of diverse ethnic and racial heritages and histories. Community archives in themselves are not new to those nations, nor are they limited to ethnically or racially based communities. Archives and historical societies have existed since the nineteenth century, and folk-life and oral history collections have been seeking to capture and recover disappearing or unrecorded history since the 1930s. The emergence of such entities addressed not only the contributions of immigrant communities, but also, in the case of the United States, the experiences and contributions of African Americans, including former slaves, the legacy of the Confederacy in the Southern states after the Civil War of the 1860s, and the impact of the Great Depression in the 1930s—all aspects of American history that community members, historians, and folklorists believed were not well represented in mainstream institutional archives.³⁴ In the United Kingdom, the "history-from-below" movement, in concert with the rise of social or people's history,³⁵ was also influential, especially in documenting labor and women's movements in the 1970s and 1980s.³⁶

In Canada, Total Archives, formally articulated by Wilfred Smith in 1972 but with much older roots,³⁷ sought to document all of Canadian society through the acquisition of all forms of documentary media, both publicly and privately generated; to control that documentation from creation to final disposition; and to develop archival networks.

However, community archives, variously conceived of or referred to today as community-led, -centric, or -based archives; DIY (do-it-yourself), grassroots, oppositional, participatory, or independent archives;³⁸ and archives from-the-bottom-up, are no longer a phenomenon predominantly of countries with a significant colonial, immigrant, slavery, refugee, or labor history or with a tradition of independent or private archives. They are increasingly emerging around the globe in physical, digital, and hybrid forms due, in part, to a compelling contemporary mix of political, professional, and technological factors that go far beyond these earlier forms of community heritage and documentary efforts. Political factors include community organizing in support of democratization efforts and social justice activism, and responding to tensions between national and community identities and narratives that pivot around debates over assimilation and pluralization, recognition of rights and obligations, and self-determination. Concerns about historical and contemporary asymmetries in power and the ways in which archives of different types might reinforce or redress those asymmetries often bind these particular factors together. Professional factors include the blurring of distinctions between archives and other kinds of information, memory, and heritage institutions and their associated professions and practices, and a growing realization on the part of the archival profession that many kinds of disciplinary, cultural, and community expertise beyond that of the professional archivist might be relevant. Finally, technological factors include the opportunities for community voices to be recorded, stored, presented, disseminated, accessed, and augmented, often independently of physical archives by employing social media, mobile technologies, and cloud computing. The technological factors, coupled with a social justice orientation that occurs in many grassroots community archival efforts, also bring the community archives movement into a new dialogue with the field of community informatics.³⁹

British archival scholar Andrew Flinn, one of the leading researchers examining the community archives phenomenon, reminds us that while the term "community" can and does take on many different meanings depending upon the context, the application of the term "archives" to an entity that might bear few, if any, of the hallmarks of a professionally run institutional archives (for example, a physical repository with a permanent collection, professionally trained archival staff, and adherence to archival standards and best practices) is also contested.⁴⁰ Such variation and contestation can make it difficult to pin down the exact parameters of community archives and thus to talk about them in generalities. Flinn himself uses the term "community archives" broadly and inclusively, stressing that "the definition of the community is one which is based upon self-identification by the participants and that in terms of the motivation behind and ownership of the archival activity, the community should play a significant, even dominant role."⁴¹ He makes a distinction between communities that are largely inspired by interest, leisure, or antiquarianism (as was the case in many of the early efforts referenced above) and those driven by a more political agenda (be that educational, commemorative, empowering, or transforming).⁴² Indeed, he notes that "independent and community-led archival endeavors" are often "explicitly identified with a political agenda and purpose."⁴³

The Voice, Identity, and Activism (VIA) Framework depicted in Table 1.2, which I developed based on research and other forms of community engagement of faculty and students at the University of California-Los Angeles, identifies, although not exhaustively, factors and considerations that can come into play relating to recordkeeping, documentation, and archives from the standpoint of and in accordance with the interests of communities and groups seeking to organize, to project, or to protect their identities, issues, and rights; to pursue social justice agendas; and to have their beliefs and experiences acknowledged.⁴⁴ The framework has three guiding principles:

1. The interests, needs, and well-being of the community are central. Robust and recognized recordkeeping and archives are as critical to the empowerment and profile development of grassroots, identity- and issue-based, and activist communities as they have

traditionally been to high-power organizations and bureaucracies such as governments, corporations, religious organizations, and academic institutions, even if their manifestations may not take on the same forms as those found in more "mainstream" settings. They are, therefore, a fundamental component of social justice, civil rights, and democratic movements and have direct impact upon the lives and well-being of communities and their constituents.

2. Community records and heritage materials should not simply be approached by archives and collecting institutions external to the community as collectibles, "rescue" or "salvage" projects, or means to diversify or "round out" existing documentary sources. Instead, the place and meaning of community archives and their contents need to be clearly understood in any potential archival relationship between the community and an external collecting institution and a mutually beneficial partnership approach devised.
3. A community-centric framework for approaching archives and recordkeeping should recognize that important and constantly evolving community interests, epistemologies, demographics, and emotions must be addressed in recordkeeping and archives activities and that these will present challenges necessitating a rethinking of "mainstream" archival practices as well as a heightened understanding of those of the communities in question.

It should be noted that not all factors and considerations are present in each context, and the VIA Framework is not meant to be a checklist or to conflate distinct concerns that exist within individual communities. Rather, the framework seeks to raise consciousness of the presence of such factors and considerations within communities, within archivists and archival researchers from noncommunity institutions seeking to partner with those communities, and within students preparing for professional careers that may involve them with community archives.

Table 1.2. Voice, Identity, Activism (VIA): A community-centric framework for approaching archives and recordkeeping

VIA-relevant communities:	Examples:
	• Activist groups, e.g., antidevelopment/urban redevelopment; antimilitarism, civil rights, environmental, economic action, organized labor, prodemocracy activists. Alternative movements. • Arts and music communities, e.g., artists' collectives, community arts and murals projects, and music festivals. • Ethnically or racially based immigrant and diasporic communities. • Gender-, gender-identification-, or sexual-orientation-based communities. • Genocide survivors and victims of ethnic cleansing. • Hidden or invisible communities, e.g., undocumented immigrants or students, gangs, mental health patients. • Homeless populations. • Human trafficking victims and their families and descendants. • Incarcerated individuals (current and former). • Indigenous/aboriginal/native communities. • Migrant worker and day laborer populations. • Military veterans. • Religious communities. NOTE: Communities may overlap in membership, and boundaries may be both fuzzy and fluid. They will usually have subcommunities, hierarchies, and power dimensions, may not necessarily be cohesive, and are always dynamic.
Motivations for archives and recordkeeping:	Examples of related activities:
To have voice	• Promoting and communicating community-centric narratives, perspectives, and experiences. • Maximizing or exposing the amount, type, and limitations of voice available to community members.
Community and pan-community identity development (inward and outward orientation)	• Community organizing and agenda development. • Communicating. • Sharing. • Displaying. • Individual and joint programming. • Educational, cultural, and memorialization activities. • Fund-raising and asset identification. • Networking information resources. • Reaching or acknowledging consensus (explicit or tacit) about what history has to be remembered, communicated, passed down, or otherwise saved.
Community activism and struggles in support of social justice objectives	• Collection and mobilization of evidence and information in support of achieving human, civil, moral, and other rights, equity, dignity, and reconciliation. • Repatriation, recovery, and obviation of appropriation of cultural goods, traditional knowledge, and community places.
(cont.)	

Conflict resolution/postconflict recovery	• Coalition and alliance-building through shared concerns, experiences, or knowledge, or in solidarity. • Consciousness-raising. • Collection and mobilization of evidence, information, and cultural goods in support of special tribunals and other legal bodies as well as of rights to reparations and compensation and the determination of geographic boundaries and traditional lands. • Statements in support of community, religious, and national identity. • Development of new national identities.
Commemoration, celebration, affirmation, recovery, therapy, and mourning	• Collective and individual remembering of persecution, liberation, disasters, epidemics, acts of defiance, and other defining events in the history of the community. • Commitment "never to forget." • Recovery of community memory, heritage, culture, belief systems, traditional practices, lands, and language.
Recordkeeping	• Addressing internally and externally imposed administrative, legal, fiscal, knowledge management, accountability/transparency, and access needs and requirements for records. • Ensuring appropriate access, privacy, and security regimes for records. • Tracking rights and responsibilities, e.g., regarding reparations, compensation, and benefits due to community members. • Ensuring acknowledgment of authors and co-creators and addressing their rights. • Documenting land and property ownership, e.g., traditional lands, community or personal property seized or confiscated during military actions.
Community characteristics:	Examples, manifestations, and considerations:
Resiliency	• Sustainability. • Health and well-being. • Ability to grow and change. • Ability to form, become dormant, and be reactivated as needed. • Depth as well as breadth of engagement.
Location or place	• Physical and/or virtual places and spaces. • Single or distributed location. • Mobile archives. • Unlocatedness/lack of place. • Dislocatedness. • Affective (emotional and/or aesthetic) places and spaces. • Sacred/spiritual places and spaces. • Diasporic/dispersed locations. • Invisible or hidden communities. • Inward and outward orientation of communities. • Landscapes of memory.
(cont.)	

Affective aspects (emotions)	• Voluntary vs. involuntary locations. • Stable vs. unstable locations. • Accessibility and proximity to community members. • Anger. • Aspiration. • Compulsion. • Dignity. • Disappointment. • Distrust. • Excitement. • Exclusivity. • Fear. • Feelings of "otherness." • Grief. • Guilt. • Hope. • Independence. • Inspiration. • Intimacy. • Low self-worth. • Pride. • Regret. • Reification of memory. • Resilience. • Self-deprecation. • Sentimentality. • Shame. • Spirituality. • Thankfulness. • Trauma.
Affective aspects (manifestations)	• Desire or imperative to tell or celebrate one's story inside and outside the community, with or without anonymity or pseudonymity. • Concealing one's story from all but trusted insiders. • Fear that stories needing to be heard by community members would not be available to them, or would be inappropriately made available if in the hands of external institutions. • Fear that external institutions would expose vulnerable individuals (e.g., "preserving the closet," victims of persecution). • Fear of obliteration or alteration of documentation or exposure to persecution if documentation is all gathered in one place and/or name indexes or dossiers are compiled and made widely available. • Sense that one's life doesn't merit archival attention and preservation. • Desire to forget. • Conflicted emotions about recordkeeping, e.g., concerns about or memories of external tracking or surveillance of community and its members, aversion to externally imposed recordkeeping or reporting requirements. • Hoarding vs. storing (cont.)

Generational considerations	• Importance of viewing and listening, playing and displaying. • Material objects serving as memory triggers. • Changing community demographics and dynamics. • Multigenerational communities • Intergenerational memory transfer and cultural and protocol barriers thereto. • Attitudes and affects relating to inherited documentation. • Changes in attitudes toward the past and the present resulting from generational and attitudinal shifts, sociopolitical gains, and cultural assimilation. • Differences between communities regularly replenished by immigration and those made up of successive generations of children born in the adopted country. • Shifts in identity due to assimilation, intermarriage, or deliberate dispersion of community members (e.g., through relocation or rehousing programs). • Community rules and sentiments about eligibility for membership such as tribal blood quantum requirements. • Shifting emphases between forgetting and remembering of defining or iconic events or experiences in community memory (e.g., Holocaust survivors and their descendants).
Conceptual, epistemological, and belief systems	• Understandings of power, ownership, time, stewardship, trust, what is secret or sacred, and what can be said and which stories told or recorded and what not, when, and under what circumstances. • Community ontologies. • Protocols for knowledge transmission inside and outside the community. • Protocols for handling sensitive objects, for ritual performance, or for behaviors within sacred spaces. • Protocols regarding language and specific words.
Required specialized or insider knowledge, insight, experience, or personal attribute	• Need for insider knowledge to "explain" the records to others and to "read" what the records say and don't say or to pick up on community "markers." • Understanding language/vocabulary/community semantics, rituals and protocols and community protocols for learning, hearing, describing, preserving, performing, or otherwise handling or transmitting certain knowledge or documentation, for example, relating to gender, age, community affiliation. • Understanding the roles of and respecting and working with community elders, tribal councils, and other community bodies, and with community ethics review boards.
Documentation characteristics:	Examples of archival and recordkeeping considerations:
Perceived or actual paucity of records and textual documentation	• Loss or lack of textual and bureaucratic records and other documentation presenting community perspectives and experiences, especially in comparison to records and other documentation externally created about the community. • Investment of "recordness" in disparate, often otherwise commonplace objects, including "what they carried with them" and "what they were given." (cont.)

Perceptions of quality or value of records and various forms of documentation	• Purposive creation of documentation, often in multimedia or performative forms. • Fugitive documentation. • Personal mementos, "what they carried with them," and "what they were given." • Inability to establish reliability and/or authenticity of records, either because of inability to trace their provenance or because of a lack of formal recordkeeping processes and forms. • Incidental, accidental, or nonexpert photography, or oral or video recordings. Materials in poor preservation state. • "Saving what survived." • Attributing other values to materials, e.g., associative, recovery/reconstruction, sentimental. • Performative qualities. • Representational limitations of different forms of documentation. • Affective value/value as affect.
Nature of recordkeeping, records, and archives	• Recordkeeping based in oral, music, dance, or other kinetic and/or ritual traditions. • Designated or trusted living recordkeepers or storytellers, e.g., griots, community elders, family history-keepers, heritage language speakers, avocational community archivists. • Survivors and witnesses. • No physical archives in a traditional professional sense. • Community language as a living archives. • Social networks as living archives. • Reliability, authenticity, originality, and even long-term sustainability of materials may not be primary preoccupations. • The knowledge of interest to the community may reside as much, if not more, in context about the content than in the content itself.
Nontextual forms of records and recordkeeping processes; Nontraditional sites of creation of documentation	• Winter counts, barks, stories and storytelling, music forms such as Native American drum beats, jazz and hip hop. • Jewelry. • Spoken language. • Site-specificity. • Indigenous "keeping places." • Planning meetings. • Political events. • Cultural festivals. • Performances. • Lectures • Artists and writers' collectives and workshops. • Development/redevelopment projects. • Informal gatherings. • Restaurants. (cont.)

Distributed or networked documentation	• Shops. • Churches and other religious spaces. • Places or moments of testifying. • Social media sites and other "unlocated" locations. • Coconstitution between authors and audiences. • Dispersion through diaspora, war, disaster, theft/looting, or community relocation. • Documentation linked through websites and portals. • Materials generated through social media. Networked genealogical information/genealogy networks. • Hierarchical and nonhierarchical production.
Policy considerations:	Examples:
Indigenous and other cultural protocols	• Implications of sovereignty or legal guarantees of self-determination for the creation, preservation, description, ownership, and access of records and traditional or community knowledge and cultural practices? • Are professional best practices best for the community? • Are community protocols an empowering and feasible approach for a community/for multiple communities? • Oversight, participation and processes for developing community protocols. • How community protocols of one community might interact with those of another community or with the practices of noncommunity institutions (including professional and international best practices and standards)? • Processes for and implications of the evolution, updating, and promulgation of community protocols.
Ownership	• Community understandings about ownership, e.g., that materials are of community rather than individual provenance or authorship, that some kinds of records or documentation cannot be owned, or that records created about the community with or without its consent might belong to the community. • Combating physical, intellectual, and cultural appropriation of community materials. • Replevin actions. • Repatriation and/or digital repatriation and recovery initiatives. • Determining those aspects of a documentary object to which notions of ownership pertain. • Specifying protocols and policy regarding the commodification/commercialization of community heritage or legacy by the community and by other parties.
Ethics	• Implementing community ethics review boards or processes. • Ensuring equal or equitable voice in all aspects of partnership projects with noncommunity groups and individuals. • Balancing the political and public nature of empowerment and recovery with individual privacy or personal or community vulnerability concerns. • Protecting sacred and secret knowledge. (cont.)

Preservation	• Ensuring that conservation and restoration practices are in accordance with community beliefs and practices, e.g., for recordings of heritage language or traditional storage, for preserving ritual items, and for keeping materials "alive." • Identifying preservation priorities and mechanisms for materials in an environment of very limited resources. • Ensuring that digital preservation practices are in accordance with community beliefs and practices. • Exploring the potential for sharing preservation facilities and other resources across multiple communities. • Understanding preservation implications of repatriated materials, as well as of digital repatriation and recovery.
Description	• Importance of organizing and providing access points to meet community needs, e.g., key topics, forms of expression, language, appropriate disclosure of information and stories. • Ensuring that descriptive tools and their accessibility/dissemination address concerns about privacy and vulnerability, e.g., avoiding "dossier compilation" and "outing" individuals. • Who should/can describe? Who is the expert? • Identifying and addressing co-creator roles and interests through description. • Developing models and policies for exporting or linking descriptive metadata to wider information systems.
Access	• Who may and who may not access a community's archives or documentation, and under what conditions and legal requirements? • How should that access be facilitated? • Does the community have a priority constituency, agenda, or critical issue or event that would influence access and/or digitization considerations? • Ensuring accessibility to the community of community materials held within noncommunity institutions. • Addressing access concerns regarding images and recordings of community materials created and disseminated by noncommunity institutions and individuals. • Identifying digitization priorities and mechanisms for materials in an environment of very limited resources. • Ensuring that digitization practices are in accordance with community beliefs and practices.
Agency	• Who may speak for the community? • Who should be consulted within the community on records and archival matters? • What kind of archival role(s) might exist within the community and who performs or should perform those roles? • What is the background (e.g., insider/outsider, "double-insider") and positionality of the archivist? • What language and vocabulary are or should be employed? • To whom, if anyone, is the community or its organizations accountable or beholden? • Who supports archival endeavors, politically, financially, emotionally, and in what ways? (cont.)

Compliance with external recordkeeping requirements	• What kinds of partnerships or relationships exist within or between communities that might be relevant to their archives and recordkeeping? • Are there identifiable moments when or reasons why community archives and records might reasonably be given to or placed within more mainstream archives, e.g., a political agenda has been achieved; community documentation is at demonstrable risk? • Reporting requirements to receive recognition, aid, or benefits. • Maintenance of dual recordkeeping systems, e.g., according to community practices as well as external legal, regulatory or professional requirements, for accountability, funding, industry, judicial, military, educational, or other reasons.
Admissibility of records	• Demonstration of trustworthiness of records, e.g., circumstances of creation and preservation, chain-of-custody, transparency. • Admissibility of nontextual records in courts as evidence.

Co-creatorship

Co-creatorship and the closely related constructs of *multiple simultaneous* and *parallel provenance* have arisen in archival research (particularly records continuum research) concerning the genesis of records and how this should best be described,⁴⁵ and from archival work in postcolonial and gender studies contexts. These propositions argue that traditional notions of provenance are oversimplified. With their emphasis on a single creating entity, those notions fail to acknowledge that multiple parties with different types of relationships to each other can be involved in the genesis of records. The propositions maintain, for example, that subjects as well as creators of records should be acknowledged as participants in that genesis and that archivists have an ethical imperative to pursue descriptive mechanisms for representing both creator and co-creator worldviews and experiences, and supporting diverse user needs and concerns, within and relating to a given community of records.⁴⁶ As the Pluralizing the Archival Curriculum Group (PACG) points out,

They challenge existing constructs of the archive itself, as well as ownership and other rights in record. They point to the need to take into account the multiple perspectives and requirements of the co-creators of records in appraisal decisions; capture their multiple perspectives and contexts in archival description; and reflect and negotiate a matrix of mutual rights and obligations in archival policy making and in the development of professional codes of ethics.⁴⁷

In a physical world, much of archival arrangement and description is bound by the facts that materials can be in only one place and one arrangement at a time, and that archival descriptive tools are resource intensive and cumbersome to create and update. All of these practical considerations support using single provenance as the dominant mechanism for arranging and describing archives. In a digital world, however, it can become much easier to discern multiple and simultaneous provenance from the traces left behind, such as audit trails, routing information, and data stamps. It is also easier to support multiple arrangements of the same materials; to make evident their documentary relationships to materials from other series or *fonds*; to provide alternate, or alternative, views of finding aids and other descriptive tools; and to open those tools up to others for annotation and emendation.

An important point not to be lost in this discussion is that archival theory is frequently the result of a rationalization of practice, or of what is practically possible when working with archives (i.e., it is inductive), rather than of theorizing first (i.e., deductive reasoning) and then implementing that theory. While Hurley's theorizing involves contemplating the provenancial complexities of actual record series, how multiple simultaneous and parallel provenance might be practically implemented in archival arrangement and description stymies its impact on archival thinking. If what is practically possible expands, however, the corresponding theory also has the potential to take hold and even to expand to contemplate a wider range of possibilities.

Digital Repatriation

In a somewhat different vein of discourse about custody, archives engage increasingly in repatriating their holdings (either the original materials or digital versions thereof) to the communities about which they were created or from whom they were removed, often without consent. A constant limitation in debates about repatriation is the physicality of the materials involved. Sometimes those materials are legitimately or perforce the records of two different countries, but they could only physically reside in one. Sometimes they have been removed or appropriated during wars or other conflicts or even by collectors and researchers from other countries.

Sometimes the physical safety of materials in their current location raises concerns, and a movement begins to relocate them, but relocation can result in them being separated physically (and sometimes intellectually, culturally, or emotionally) from their originating community. Microfilming was often used to provide surrogate copies to those who did not have the original materials. Today, digital repatriation offers a wider range of possibilities for overcoming the physical considerations of keeping records but raises others about what constitutes "giving back," what is given back, the degree of physical and intellectual control over either the original or the digitized materials that any of the parties involved may or should actually have (including the conditions under which they are preserved, copyright concerns, and the adequacy and perspectives of any descriptions that are also transferred or shared), and the accessibility and usability of repatriated materials by the community to which they were repatriated.

Repatriation can occur as a result of redress, reparations, and replevin actions, in response to approaches articulated in community or Indigenous protocols, as negotiated in peace treaties or through the work of tribunals, or in circumstances where a former colonial power holds archives containing the historical records of a now-independent nation. These communities usually recognize that keeping the materials somewhere is important for a variety of reasons, but they may not have the physical facilities necessary to preserve them and make them accessible. They also do not always trust archives associated with state and academic institutions elsewhere and sometimes even in their own nations to provide stewardship of these materials in ways that take into account their needs and perspectives. They may wish to host, disseminate, and augment a digital community archives of repatriated digitized materials, to annotate materials provided online by mainstream archival repositories, or to negotiate protocols with mainstream repositories for the care and dissemination of holdings relating to them. By the same measure, however, universal, equitable access is not always the objective of community-based or grassroots archives where addressing community interests and identity needs might take priority. Understanding the underlying emotional and spiritual as well as political and social factors at play may make a big difference to the extent and scope of a repatriation effort, as well as to decisions regarding whether original, digital, or other

surrogates of materials are to be repatriated or shared. For example, do the communities seeking repatriation always want the original materials, or are they more interested in what the act of repatriation, even if of digital copies, symbolizes in terms of acknowledging and respecting their rights and worldviews? Do they desire the materials for what they say or contain or for what they represent in the minds of the community?

The Archival Multiverse

The concept of the *archival multiverse* emerged in the past two years from the Pluralizing the Archival Curriculum Group (PACG), an international working group of faculty and doctoral students who have been participating in the annual AERI, and it has been gaining traction in the archival field. American philosopher and psychologist William James originally conceptualized the multiverse in 1895, and fields as wide-ranging as physics, psychology, and literature use the term today to refer to a hypothetical set of multiple possible universes.⁴⁸ The archival multiverse is arguably the metaconstruct that overarches the above-referenced concepts, most of which attempt to introduce relativist or additional community and international perspectives to a paradigm at heart positivist, nation oriented, and modern in its conceptualization. It refers to “the plurality of evidentiary texts, memory-keeping practices and institutions, bureaucratic and personal motivations, community perspectives and needs, and cultural and legal constructs with which archival professionals and academics must be prepared . . . to engage.”⁴⁹ A recent report authored by the PACG focuses on the role of archival education and research within archival studies, articulating the central challenge the archival multiverse presents to the traditional archival paradigm:

How do we move from an archival universe dominated by one cultural paradigm to an archival multiverse; from a world constructed in terms of “the one” and “the other” to a world of multiple ways of knowing and practicing, of multiple narratives co-existing in one space? An important related question is, How do we accept that there may be incommensurable ontologies and epistemologies between communities that surface in differing cultural expressions and notions of cultural property and find ways to accept and work within that reality?⁵⁰

Notes

- ¹ Doris Estelle Long, “The Impact of Foreign Investment on Indigenous Culture: An Intellectual Property Perspective,” *North Carolina Journal of International Law and Commercial Regulation* 229 (1998): 240. Cited in Rehka Ramani, “Note and Comment: Market Realities v. Indigenous Equities,” *Brooklyn Journal of International Law* 26 (2001): 1147.
- ² Terry Cook, “Evidence, Memory, Identity, and Community: Four Shifting Archival Paradigms,” *Archival Science*, DOI 10.1007/s10502-012-9180-7.
- ³ Xiaomi An and Wang Wang, “Towards Comprehensive Integration Management of Business Continuity, Records and Knowledge,” in *Proceedings of the 6th International Conference on Networked Computing and Advanced Information Management*, Seoul, South Korea, August 16–18, 2010, 5–9.
- ⁴ Roland Robertson, “Comments on the ‘Global Triad’ and ‘Glocalization,’” Institute for Japanese Culture and Classics, Conference on Globalization and Indigenous Culture, 1997, <http://www2.kokugakuin.ac.jp/ijcc/wp/global/15robertson.html>. See also Robertson, “The Conceptual Promise of Glocalization: Commonality and Diversity,” *ART-e-FACT: Strategies of Resistance*, no. 4, http://artefact.mi2.hr/_a04/lang_en/theory_robertson_en.htm.
- ⁵ Anne J. Gilliland-Swetland, *Enduring Paradigms, New Opportunities: The Value of the Archival Perspective in the Digital Environment* (Washington, D.C.: Council on Library and Information Resources, 2000).
- ⁶ Thomas S. Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962).
- ⁷ It should be noted that the structure of this table reflects an American perspective on the archival paradigm. Other archival traditions, particularly those based in records continuum ideas might order or group some of the components differently.
- ⁸ Cook, “Evidence, Memory, Identity, and Community,” 2012 preprint.
- ⁹ Sue McKemmish, “Are Records Ever Actual?,” in *The Records Continuum: Ian Maclean and Australian Archives First Fifty Years*, ed. Sue McKemmish and Michael Piggott (Clayton, Aus.: Ancora Press in association with Australian Archives, 1994), 187–203.
- ¹⁰ Anne J. Gilliland and Sue McKemmish, Introduction and “Building an Infrastructure for Archival Research,” *Archival Science* 3–4 (2004): 143–47, 149–99.
- ¹¹ Carol Couture and Daniel Ducharme, “Research in Archival Science: A Status Report,” *Archivaria* 59 (2005): 41–67. The article was first published in French as “La recherche en archivistique: un état de la question,” *Archives* 30, nos. 3–4 (1998): 11–38.
- ¹² Anne Gilliland and Sue McKemmish, “Archival and Recordkeeping Research: Past, Present and Future,” in *Research Methods: Information Management, Systems, and Contexts* (Pahran, Aus.: Tilde University Press, 2013).
- ¹³ See, for example, Cook, “Evidence, Memory, Identity, and Community”; Fiona Ross, Sue McKemmish, and Shannon Faulkhead, “Indigenous Knowledge and the Archives: Designing Trusted Archival Systems for Koorie Communities,” *Archives and Manuscripts* 34, no. 2 (2006): 112–49; and Anne J. Gilliland and Sue McKemmish, “Recordkeeping Metadata, the Archival Multiverse, and Societal Grand Challenges,” in *Proceedings of the International Conference on Dublin Core and Metadata Applications 2012*, Kuching, Malaysia, September 2012, 106–15, <http://dcpapers.dublincore.org/pubs/article/view/3661>.
- ¹⁴ Luciana Duranti, “Archives as a Place,” *Archives and Manuscripts* 24, no. 2 (1996): 242–55. Republished in *Archives and Social Studies: A Journal of Interdisciplinary Research* 1, no. 1 (2007), Archivo Municipal Cartagena, <http://tinyurl.com/2dbasvb>.

- ¹⁵ Duranti, "Archives as a Place." See also Terry Eastwood, "Should Creating Agencies Keep Electronic Records Indefinitely?" *Archives and Manuscripts* 24 (November 1996): 256–67.
- ¹⁶ F. Gerald Ham, "Archival Strategies for the Post-custodial Era," *The American Archivist* 44 (Summer 1981): 207.
- ¹⁷ Glenda Acland, "Managing the Record Rather Than the Relic," *Archives and Manuscripts* 20, no. 1 (1992): 58–59.
- ¹⁸ For example, David A. Bearman, "Record-keeping Systems," *Archivaria* 36 (1993): 16–37.
- ¹⁹ Frank Upward, "Structuring the Records Continuum Part One: Post-custodial Principles and Properties," *Archives and Manuscripts* 24 (1996): 268–85.
- ²⁰ Charles M. Dolla, *The Impact of Information Technologies on Archival Principles and Method* (Macerata, Italy: University of Macerata Press, 1992), 75–76; and Linda J. Henry, "Schellenberg in Cyberspace," *American Archivist* 61 (Fall 1998): 319.
- ²¹ Upward, "Structuring the Records Continuum Part One."
- ²² David Bearman, "An Indefensible Bastion: Archives as a Repository in the Electronic Age," in *Archival Management of Electronic Records*, ed. David Bearman (Pittsburgh: Archives and Museum Informatics, 1991): 14–24; Kenneth Thibodeau, "To Be or Not to Be: Archives for Electronic Records," in *Archival Management of Electronic Records*, 1–13; Sue McKemmish and Frank Upward, "Somewhere Beyond Custody," *Archives and Manuscripts* 22, no. 1 (1994): 138–49; Steve Stuckey, "Keepers of the Fame? The Custodial Role of Australian Archives—Its History and Its Future," *Archives and Manuscripts* 22, no. 1 (1994): 35–48; Greg O'Shea and David Roberts, "Living in a Digital World: Recognizing the Electronic and Post-custodial Realities," *Archives and Manuscripts* 24, no. 2 (1996): 286–311; Adrian Cunningham, "Commentary: Journey to the End of the Night: Custody and the Dawning of a New Era on the Archival Threshold," *Archives and Manuscripts* 24, no. 2 (1996): 312–21; and Jeannette Bastian, "Taking Custody, Giving Access: A Post-custodial Role for a New Century," *Archivaria* 53 (2002): 76–93.
- ²³ For example, Sentilles observes that when researching for a cultural biography on U.S. Civil War actress Adah Isaacs Menken, "had I relied on digital archives, I would have missed nonverbal clues in my search. What surrounds the materials found? How is it placed within the larger document? What does the cover of the item suggest about the target audience and how it was being packaged for sale? Does the quality of paper or print suggest something valuable about its production that changes the way we interpret the words on the page? For scholars of the history of the book and many historians using material culture, digital reproductions are not adequate substitutions for artifacts." Renée M. Sentilles, "The Archives of Cyberspace," in *Archive Stories: Facts, Fictions and the Writing of History*, ed. Antoinette Burton (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 2005), 146.
- ²⁴ Jacques Derrida, *Archive Fever: A Freudian Impression*, trans. Eric Prenowitz (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996).
- ²⁵ See, for example, Tom Nesmith, "Still Fuzzy, But More Accurate: Some Thoughts on the 'Ghosts' of Archival Theory," *Archivaria* 47 (Spring 1999): 136–50; Joan M. Schwartz and Terry Cook, "Archives, Records and Power: The Making of Modern Memory," *Archival Science* 2 (2002): 1–19; and Sue McKemmish, "Placing Records Continuum Theory and Practice," *Archival Science* 1 (2001): 333–59.
- ²⁶ Eric Ketelaar, "Archivalisation and Archiving," *Archives and Manuscripts* 27 (1999): 54–61.
- ²⁷ Anne Gilliland, "Afterword: In and Out of the Archives," in *Interdisciplinary Essays on European Knowledge Culture, 1400–1900*, ed. Randolph Head, special issue, *Archival Science* 10, no. 3 (September 2010): 333–43.
- ²⁸ Jeannette Bastian, *Owning Memory: How a Caribbean Community Lost Its Archives and Found Its History* (Westport, Conn.: Libraries Unlimited, 2003); Andrew Flinn, Mary Stevens, and Elizabeth Shepherd, "Whose Memories, Whose Archives? Independent Community Archives, Autonomy and

- the Mainstream," *Archival Science* 9 (2009): 71–86; Kelvin L. White, "Meztizaje and Remembering in Afro-Mexican Communities of the Costa Chica: Implications for Archival Education in Mexico," *Archival Science* 9, nos. 1–2 (2009); Michelle Caswell, "Khmer Rouge Archives: Accountability, Truth, and Memory in Cambodia," *Archival Science* 11 (2011); and Ruth Bayhille, "Tribal Archives: A Study in Records, Memory and Power," (PhD diss., University of California–Los Angeles, 2011).
- ²⁹ W. James Booth, "Communities of Memory: On Identity, Memory, and Debt," *American Political Science Review* 93 (1999): 249–63.
- ³⁰ Eric Ketelaar, "Sharing: Collected Memories in Communities of Records," *Archives and Manuscripts* 33 (2005): 50.
- ³¹ Sue McKemmish, Anne Gilliland, and Eric Ketelaar, "'Communities of Memory': Pluralising Archival Research and Education Agendas," *Archives and Manuscripts* 5 (2005): 146–75.
- ³² Bastian, *Owning Memory*, 1–2.
- ³³ See, for example, Flinn et al., "Whose Memories, Whose Archives?" 71–86; Andrew Flinn, "Archival Activism: Independent and Community-led Archives, Radical Public History and the Heritage Professions," *InterActions: UCLA Journal of Education and Information Studies* 7, no. 2 (2011), eScholarship, University of California, <http://escholarship.org/uc/item/9pt2490x>; and Jeannette A. Bastian and Ben Alexander, eds., *Community Archives: The Shaping of Memory* (London: Facet 2009).
- ³⁴ See, for example, John J. Appel, *Immigrant Historical Societies in the United States, 1880–1950* (New York: Arno Press, 1980); Faith Davis Ruffins, "Mythos, Memory, and History: African-American Preservation Efforts, 1820–1990," in *Museums and Communities: The Politics of Public Culture*, ed. Ivan Karp, Christine Mullen Kreamer, and Steven D. Lavine (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution, 1992); and John Higham, "The Ethnic Historical Society in Changing Times," *Journal of American Ethnic History* 13, no. 2 (1994): 30–44.
- ³⁵ See Howard Zinn, *A People's History of the United States* (New York: Harper and Row, 1980).
- ³⁶ See, for example, Ben Blake, "The New Archives for American Labor: From Attic to Digital Shop Floor," *The American Archivist* 70, no. 1 (2007): 130–50; and Graham Smith, "The Making of Oral History: Sections 1–2," in *Making History: The Changing Face of the Profession in Britain* (London: Institute of Historical Research, 2008), *Making History*, http://www.history.ac.uk/makinghistory/resources/articles/oral_history.html.
- ³⁷ Wilfred I. Smith, *Archives: Mirror of Canada Past* (Toronto, Ont.: University of Toronto Press, 1972).
- ³⁸ By "independent archives," I am referring to archives that are not aligned with government, academic, or other mainstream archives, and that often are not publicly funded, but whose existence is one hallmark of a democratic, pluralistic state.
- ³⁹ Sawyer and Rosenbaum define "social informatics" as a problem-driven "interdisciplinary study of the design, uses and consequences of information and communication technologies (ICTs) that takes into account their interactions with institutional and cultural contexts. Social informatics research may be done at group, departmental, organizational, national and/or societal levels of analysis, focused on the relationships among information, information systems, the people who use them and the context of use." See Steve Sawyer and Howard Rosenbaum, "Social Informatics in the Information Sciences: Current Activities and Emerging Directions," *Informing Science* 3, no. 2 (2000): 1, <http://www.inform.nu/Articles/Vol3/v3n2p89-96r.pdf>. Williams and Durrance describe "community informatics" as a field that encompasses both study and practice aspects, one that emerged relatively recently out of library practice and that operates at a nexus between digital information and communication technologies and historical local communities. Community informatics is strongly influenced by social informatics and is largely concerned with the transformative effects of digital information technology upon these communities as well as inequities that might be created or reinforced relating to the accessibility and usability of information technology and

digital information resources. See Kate Williams and Joan Durrance, "Community Informatics," *Encyclopedia for Library and Information Science*, 3rd ed. (New York: Taylor and Francis, 2009), 1.

⁴⁰ Flinn, "Archival Activism," 6–7.

⁴¹ Flinn, "Archival Activism," 7.

⁴² Flinn, "Archival Activism," 8.

⁴³ Flinn, "Archival Activism," 1.

⁴⁴ The VIA Framework is being used by archival researchers at UCLA and Monash University in ongoing research that is contemplating how key professional concepts and practices, e.g., record, recordkeeping, archives, creatorship, appraisal, description, and access, could be pluralized in ways that could take into account the needs, beliefs, practices, and concerns of grassroots, identity- or issue-based, and activist communities. It was developed based on analyses of several sources: the mission, scope, and activities of community-based archives in the United States; partnership projects, case studies, and service learning conducted by faculty and students at UCLA's Department of Information Studies and elsewhere over the past decade in multiple grassroots, identity- or issue-based, and activist communities; and characteristics and themes emerging out of the work of scholars of these fields and movement leaders. For more information on these activities, see Andrew Lau, Anne Gilliland, and Kim Anderson, "Naturalizing Community Engagement in Information Studies: Pedagogical Approaches and Persisting Partnerships," *Information, Communication and Society*, 15 no. 7 (2012): 991–1015.

⁴⁵ Chris Hurley, "Parallel Provenance: (1) What, If Anything, Is Archival Description?" *Archives and Manuscripts* 33, no. 1 (2005): 110–45; and Hurley, "Parallel Provenance: (2) When Something Is Not Related to Everything Else," *Archives and Manuscripts* 33, no. 2 (2005): 52–91, <http://www.infotech.monash.edu.au/research/groups/rcrg/publications/parallel-provenance-combined.pdf>; Ketelaar, "Sharing."

⁴⁶ Anne J. Gilliland, "Contemplating Co-creator Rights in Archival Description," *Knowledge Organization* 39, no. 5 (2012): 340–46.

⁴⁷ Archival Education and Research Institute (AERI) Pluralizing the Archival Curriculum Group (PACG), "Educating for the Archival Multiverse," *The American Archivist* 74, no. 1 (2011): 68–102.

⁴⁸ See, for example, Rajni Kothari, D. L. Sheth, and Ashis Nandy, eds., *The Multiverse of Democracy: Essays in Honour of Rajni Kothari* (Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage Publications, 1996); Ananta Kumar Giri, "Cosmopolitanism and Beyond: Towards a Multiverse of Transformations," *Development and Change* 37 (November 2006): 1277–92; and Helge Kragh, "Contemporary History of Cosmology and the Controversy over the Multiverse," *Annals of Science* 66 (October 2009): 529–51.

⁴⁹ AERI PACG, "Educating for the Archival Multiverse."

⁵⁰ Ibid.

CHAPTER 2



Reframing the Archive in a Digital Age: Balancing Continuity with Innovation and Responsibility with Responsibilities

This chapter reviews societal ideas about archives and the complex of technological, political, and ideological pressures and imperatives to which they have been subject. It argues the ongoing need to re-examine traditional understandings of core archival concepts such as record, recordkeeping, evidence, and even archives, and the nature and activities of archives and archivists in the twenty-first century in light of digital and social change.

Authors in the Nineteenth century who sought to give a more precise meaning to the word archives gave contradictory definitions of it because they followed preconceived ideas, like Ménage and Le Duchat before them. We have seen that in the predominant thought of the first of these etymologists his conception of archives was that of ancient documents; for the second, it was the idea of precious documents. Several modern authors attach to the word archives other conceptions just as little satisfactory in themselves, e.g., that of official documents, of historical documents, of authentic documents, of documents in substantiation of rights.

In actual practice, if archives are in fact composed above all of documents in great part in one or another of these categories and sometimes in all of these, it does not mean that there may not be found in the archives documents which are neither ancient nor precious nor official nor authentic nor such as substantiate rights. Let us disregard the term historical, which seems to us not to have any concrete meaning. . . . Thus we come to recognize in the term archives two meanings: one broad and vague, generally used in ordinary language, and the other narrow and precise, on which the specialists are beginning to agree. . . .

—Charles Samaran, professor of bibliography and archivistics, École Nationale des Chartes, Paris; future director general of the National Archives of France; and first chairman of the International Council on Archives; "Archives," February 1938.¹

Archives, Power, and Politics

The stereotype of archives as dark, dusty, socially removed, and relatively unchanging physical spaces has arguably helped them to remain unthreatening, low-budget presences to those whose activities they document or from whom they request resources. Frequent allegorical and fantastical allusions in literature indicate yet more popular conceptions and misconceptions of archives.² Like Charles Samaran in 1938, archivists today still find themselves constantly explaining to records creators, users, resource allocators, and the general public what they do and why it is important. This has become even more necessary in a century when the Internet Archives and Googles of the world seem, in popular perception, to be putting traditional archives out of business.

However, peeling away the stereotypes and looking back over archival history, one readily discerns that archives have always been dynamic, their content and its meanings accumulating and inevitably changing in media and format as recording technologies evolved over decades and centuries. Even if archives are at times physically removed, as entities they remain socially embedded, their rationales, contents, processes, and activities directly reflecting the contingency of archives upon their own juridical, political, social, cultural, and technological contexts. Moreover, archives have historically been closely and unabashedly associated with the exercise, structures, and worldviews of power. While archives and the records they contain generally do not explicitly intend to be unrepresentative of different perspectives, experiences, and epistemologies, they inevitably and inexorably reflect and legitimize how, when, why, and by whom those records were generated and preserved. Furthermore, different recordkeeping and archival systems, regardless of the power associated with them, are also predicated on differing worldviews that may well be in contestation with one another.

The term "archive" derives from the Greek *arkhé* ("government" or "order") and *arkheion* ("the home of the archons"). In classical Athens, the archons headed civic, military, and religious affairs and also presided over the Metroon, built around 140 BCE on the site of the old senate house that had previously housed the city's records. The Metroon not only served

as the state archives, it was also a sanctuary for Meter, the mother of the gods. The archons controlled access to the records within the Metroon.³ The power of the archons and of the Metroon was evident not only in terms of their offices and functions, but also in the prominent sandstone architecture and central placement of the Metroon within the Agora at the front of the house of the council and facing the towering Acropolis. Decrees passed by the assembly or council of Athens were first written on papyrus or wooden tablets and then transcribed onto stone steles placed on public display in the Agora, which was the seat of Athenian administrative bodies and public offices, or, if particularly important, on the Acropolis.

This close association between official authority and archives extends throughout the history of archives in the Western world,⁴ where the power of official recordkeeping has been explicitly applied not only in the administrations of governments and other large religious and mercantile bureaucracies, but also in the promulgation of official epistemologies, especially within colonial machinery. For example, the sixteenth-century Spanish court developed a new cosmography to incorporate the previously unknown (to the Spanish) human, biological, and physical phenomena they encountered in the colonies of the Indies. Ordinances and instructions were issued on how everything was to be documented and reported back to Spain and then retained within official archives.⁵ Collins and Blot write of the resulting "colonial scriptural economy" in Mexico, where "the colonizers write their histories, *relaciones*, *cartas*, using the rhetorical frameworks and within the worldview of the dominant society, within the episteme of the dominant world." Thomas Richards, writing of Victorian knowledge organization and the British Empire's need for an archives for "keeping track of keeping track," makes the important point that "it was much easier to unify an archive composed of texts than to unify an empire made of territory."⁶ Ann Laura Stoler, in her research relating to the archives of the Dutch East Indies, writes of how "the colonial order of things [can be] seen through the record of archival productions . . . archives as condensed sites of epistemological and political anxiety rather than as skewed and biased sources. These colonial archives were both transparencies in which power relations were inscribed and intricate technologies of rule in themselves."⁷

Challenges posed by digitality are not the only set of issues confronting archives today. Archives are increasingly caught up in an intellectual milieu largely characterized by “post-” discourses and with a strong focus on how history is understood, managed, and represented. In his 1897 travel account, *Following the Equator: A Journey around the World*, Mark Twain’s Pudd’nhead Wilson states that “the very ink with which all history is written is merely fluid prejudice.”⁸ Postmodernism, postcolonialism, postethnic, postwestern, and postgenderism movements and cultural projects (among others) seek in varying ways to expose power structures and prejudices at work in society and its institutions and technologies. They also challenge commonly accepted notions of objective reality and scientific and other forms of truths, high culture, and grand and metanarratives frequently projected through historical and other memory institutions such as archives. For several decades now, multifaceted critiques have been building that, until recently, have largely taken place outside the world of professional archivists—in critical theory, philosophy, sociology, anthropology, literature, new media, and other arts fields. Repudiating modern-era beliefs, values, theories, structures, and methods, as well as the historical, cultural, and bureaucratic evidence at the heart of the professionally constructed archives, these critiques focus on the concept of the *Archive* in society and its shifting mandates;⁹ on what it means *to archive*, and the *power* and *authority* associated with the Archive that wields it and how, and its effect on individuals and groups over time;¹⁰ on the basis for value judgments;¹¹ and, as a result, on *what the Archive contains*, the narratives or “truths” it supports or reinforces,¹² and how the Archive can affect our epistemologies, lives, and self-knowledge.¹³ Obviously, the critiques do not concur with more traditional professional archival theory and practices that uphold the notion of the Archive (often expressed with a capital A to denote it as a societal rather than a professional concept) as a trusted and disinterested repository of records and other documentary materials that can support accountability and historical scholarship. Rather, they tend to view the Archive, and by implication, the Archivist and Archival processes, as key players in the exercise and control of power and knowledge, as colonial agents, and as arbiters of values in society.

In so doing, these academic movements became a prime target of conservative politics in some countries, such as the United States, regarding the nature, role, value, and explication of the arts, education, heritage, and culture. Pervasive in the intellectual, educational, and cultural debates are tropes such as *culture wars*, *the past as contested terrain*, *identity politics*, *ontological incommensurability*, *dominant and counternarratives*, and *ethical and/or liberal pluralism*. These movements, however, also contributed a vocabulary and important conceptual and emancipatory frameworks and rationales for social justice activism such as redress and reconciliation actions and for nonelite community memory initiatives such as community-based archives and the new museums movement that began in the 1980s and 1990s.¹⁴ Moreover, the new digital technologies and social media greatly enhanced the ability of groups under- or misrepresented in the historical record to organize, document, collect, narrate, annotate, exhibit, and publicize their own histories independent of traditional institutions and structures. These movements also inspired a rich academic focus on nontextual and intangible or nonmaterial heritage, especially in areas such as memory, identity, and performance studies; for example, on “embodied memory” that is either inscribed or incorporated through social practices (e.g., Connerton¹⁵); performance as an “act of transfer” of social memory and cultural identity (e.g., Taylor¹⁶); landscape and sites of memory (e.g., Schama¹⁷ and Nora¹⁸); virtual culture (e.g., Jones¹⁹); oral documents (e.g., Turner²⁰); and Indigenous and other community storytelling (e.g., Faulkhead²¹). Such a focus broadens notions of “texts” as objects of study and objects that effect action, and also heightens awareness of the kinds of communities and community practices and texts that need to be included in discussions about cultural heritage, collective memory, national historical narratives, recordkeeping, community empowerment, and so forth.

Although much postmodern scholarship originated in Europe—also the cradle, in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, of the body of modernist ideas underlying contemporary archival theory and practice—it is in postcolonial settings such as Canada, Australia, and South Africa that this critique has begun to show the most influence on archival thinking. In such settings, populations tend to be racially and ethnically diverse and

their histories intertwined and often interdependent (it should be noted that this is true in former colonizing nations also). Colonial practices often still reside in living memory, and the roles played by archives in supporting such administrations and by the record in perpetuating particular worldviews to the detriment of the less empowered can be more apparent. In recent years, archival scholars such as Cook, Harris, Stoler, and Wareham added their voices to the postmodern and postcolonial critiques emanating out of other disciplines and situated them in the sphere of actual archives, that is, the places or repositories or systems and their processes, holdings, and accessibility. By so doing, they created something of a bridge between external critiques and professional practice. They acknowledged that archival repositories worldwide identify and preserve materials that relate primarily to the elites and their interests—governments, monarchs, churches, corporations, academic institutions—and that the archival paradigm descends overwhelmingly from European conceptualizations. Thus, both archives and the archival paradigm could be identified as agents in the proliferation of a grand Western-centric historical and political narrative. Seen from this view, archives might be criticized for promulgating hegemonic practices that potentially appropriate, underrepresent, and ignore, or worse, repress, distort, or even obliterate, the narratives and experiences of the “other.”

Such critiques may have most apparent relevance in the so-called New World, but the entire world is changing with globalization and ubiquitous digital media. Among their most important implications is their challenge to the archival field and to the creators of archives everywhere to think more about what exactly they consider to be “the record” and to engage more parties in assisting them in making that determination. They challenge the field to articulate better to the general public, to scholars, and to the creators of the materials they seek to preserve and make available why and how it does what it does. They challenge the field, through its metadata and curatorial practices, to make more evident the complexities and hierarchical and myriad other relationships inherent in the content of the archive, as well as the absences, silences, and trauma it reflects. And they lead society as a whole to contemplate how digital technology can help.

Archives, Pluralism, and Activism

In light of these critiques, several archivists have argued for the importance of increased reflexivity and activism on the part of archivists, including a sounder understanding of the intellectual lineage of archival science and of its own politics of memory.²² For example, Terry Cook writes:

How, for example, have archivists reflected these changing societal realities and power struggles as they built their “houses of memory”? How have archival assumptions, concepts, and strategies reflected the dominant structures and societal ethos of their own time? Upon what basis, reflecting what shifting values, have archivists decided who should be admitted into their houses of memory, and who excluded? To answer these questions, we need an intellectual history of our profession. We need to understand better our own politics of memory, the very ideas and assumptions that have shaped us, if we want our “memory houses” to reflect more accurately all components of the complex societies they allegedly serve.²³

Dutch archival scholar Eric Ketelaar warns of the power of the archive to support what he calls the “total registry.”²⁴ And indeed, one could argue that standardization of electronic record-keeping practices and metadata schemas, effected through such things as ISO standards, the Sarbanes-Oxley Act in the United States,²⁵ and professional best practices to support global information and business exchange and digital interoperability, has tremendous power to create conformity and facilitate oversight. Such developments are promoted to support not only effective and accountable government and business practices, but also the participation of all nations in the global economy. But, at the same time, as discussed in chapter 1, it can be argued that such standardization, developed predominantly through the participation and in accordance with the worldviews and priorities of the archival and recordkeeping communities of large nations, especially Western ones, may overwhelm or further marginalize regional or Indigenous practices, epistemologies, and ontologies.

Archives reframed and optimized in light of these shifting public and scholarly expectations, needs, and behaviors, as well as the imperatives and opportunities associated with digital information and communications technology, have the potential to tell more stories and to support new types of users and new ways of doing research on archival holdings of all kinds and of any provenance. They can actively contribute to the empowerment

and examination of and redress for underrepresented communities and experiences—those whose stories are not told, or whose perspectives historically have not been represented within the record. American intellectual historian Louis Menand reminds us that “the universe is plural: it hangs together, but in more ways than one.”²⁶ Archives can work toward such pluralism, not by trying to represent every possible viewpoint—such efforts inevitably lead to new reifications, marginalizations, and omissions—but by acknowledging overtly in their practices their own stance and its limitations as applied in the gathering and description of archival holdings and by striving to ensure that multiple perspectives on history and memory-keeping as well as differing disciplinary approaches and belief systems can and should simultaneously exist and be represented within the archive. Related to this, archives can also serve as loci for action, witnessing controversial events, and preserving or rescuing fugitive testimonies (as in the cases of archivists working with the United Nations Peacekeeping Mission in Darfur and with truth commissions around the world); supporting the public in gaining access to records that are concealed or repressed (as in the case of the South African History Archive [SAHA]); and intervening to prevent the illegal destruction of records worldwide.

Archives and Human Rights

If all of this seems somewhat academic and idealistic, especially in light of the ever-accumulating backlogs of materials that archives continuously need to manage, there can be no doubt that many archives worldwide face a very real set of social memory and human rights issues arising directly out of those records and an unprecedented confluence of events. The openings of formerly inaccessible government archives because mandatory closure periods have expired, the advent of new democracies, and the work of truth and reconciliation commissions (TRCs) in Europe, Africa, Latin America, and Asia coincide for the first time with the ability to disseminate information about the contents of those archives over the Internet and by other digital means.²⁷ Shocking, traumatic, misleading, but often meticulously kept records relating to official acts carried out by the Third Reich before, during, and after World War II; by the Khmer Rouge in Cambodia;

in the former Soviet Union and apartheid South Africa; and in many other locations around the globe are coming to light. And it has become apparent that sometimes the best way to safeguard the documentary record is to export it digitally (rather than physically) out of the country, as did archivists working with United Nations peacekeeping missions in Darfur. But such strategies also raise challenges for archivists in terms of how to ensure the intellectual and physical accessibility of these records for those who need to use them locally and globally, while at the same time balancing the advantages of online dissemination and delivery against considerations of the privacy and security of those mentioned in the records and the often disturbing or lurid nature of the materials.

In responding to these kinds of contested memory and human rights concerns, archives are now able to do some things, especially in partnerships between archivists and with the affected communities themselves, such as “reconstructing” archives and creating alternative archives²⁸ that were previously unimaginable given the limitations of the traditional archives. Today, many more community efforts in several countries and transnationally are developing community-centric archives, especially digital archives, that incorporate a diversity of materials gathered and presented from the community’s own perspectives.²⁹ An example of such an initiative is the Koorie Heritage Archive in Australia, where the Indigenous Koorie people’s oral history, related official records, images of Koorie artifacts, and moving images are digitized and made accessible online from a database.³⁰ Designed to be taken out into communities on a laptop computer, it is a living archives that uses technology to enable Koorie people to add their own stories and information and give their perspectives on other records in the societal Archive. Parts of the system related to content sacred or secret for Koories, or for their Elders, are restricted accordingly.³¹

Building Digital Archives

As this brief review of recent discourse indicates, stereotypes notwithstanding, conceptualizations of archives have evolved over the past hundred years, as have those of the “records” archives contain or might contain and of the “archivists” responsible for their management over time. In the

digital realm, as in the postmodern one, even the word “archives” is subject to challenge. It can mean something quite different to computer scientists, systems administrators, or digital librarians. Today, entities referred to as archives may be physical or virtual; they may be institution- or community-based;³² or they may be personally created and retained. They may be stand-alone repositories or housed within a special collections unit within a research library; they may be digitally distributed across many locations but collated as a single or transparently federated virtual archives on the Internet; they may be placed in the cloud; or they may reside only on a digital storage device and be disseminated through a personal Web page. What they all have in common, however, is that they exist intellectually at points of convergence between accountability, memory, and identity, and individual, community, and cultural concerns. Classically, archives would contain primarily, if not exclusively, original bureaucratic records. Increasingly, they include multiple versions and formats of those records, as well as a host of nonbureaucratic historical, documentary, and other nonpublished or primary materials, many of which do not come in traditional textual forms and whose status as records archivists widely debate. These might include oral and visual histories; scientific data such as satellite images, read-outs from digital instrumentation, and digital lab notebooks; virtual re-creations of architecture or performances; and nontangible community records such as Indigenous stories, songlines, winter counts, and barks.

Today’s professional archivist is not just a historian or custodian of records, but a highly trained archival expert who advocates for the record and who may also take on roles as a record-keeping systems analyst, metadata architect, digital curator, digital asset manager, videographer, oral historian, ethnographer, or community activist. However, there have always been individuals who are not archivists by virtue of professional education and experience, but rather by avocation or perforce, such as the designated family or community historian, the high school yearbook committee chair, or the rescuer of unwanted film or home movies.³³ Even in cyberspace, they are the individuals who recognize the imperative to archive and who operate at many different levels recording, capturing, and

preserving—for example, the manager of the social networking site or the archiver of the listserv.³⁴

As the discussion in subsequent chapters of this book illustrates, defining and modeling core concepts such as the *archive*, the *record*, and *evidence* when these have a substantial or even purely virtual existence might seem a comparatively simple task, until one actually tries to do it. The rootedness of the archival paradigm in physicality only really started to become evident in the twentieth century, first with the need to cope with various new audiovisual recording technologies and then with computing and networked technologies. As the pre-eminence of the physicality of the archive declines, it should provoke archivists to contemplate more closely several questions associated with that physicality. For example, what exactly is the *affect* of the physicality of the archive? Or of the record, for that matter? And what is the nature of the relationship between that affect and the physicality of the materials held in the archive, their housing and description, and their power? What happens when the physicality goes away, as it surely will in the near future as the amount of born-digital materials increases and materials in more traditional forms are digitized? What are the implications of disbinding and other forms of deconstruction of the physical arrangement of archival materials to facilitate digitization for how users understand and experience those materials? Will dematerializing the arrangement of archival materials result in a less tight coupling between arrangement and description than is traditional? Does dematerialization increase society’s need for other means to establish trust in a record? At the same time, it is important to be cognizant that the infrastructure supporting our digital world, even the cloud, is still profoundly physical. It relies upon a complex of physical components such as hard drives and servers that must be physically located somewhere. Powering this infrastructure and maintaining all the data it contains require vast amounts of energy and result in the emission of vast amounts of heat. Information technology manufacturers and storage and service providers will be increasingly challenged to diminish its environmental and community impact, and when it does, new archival considerations will undoubtedly arise.

It is unlikely, and, it could be argued, undesirable, even in a future where all production is digital and all materials not born digital are digitized, that

all archives will become repositories solely of digital materials. At the same time, there is no doubt that digital content and capabilities will transform physical archives, and that the conceptual as well as the practical aspects of the archival paradigm will require some reframing. For traditional, and traditionally underresourced, archives, however, a future that incorporates responsibility for an exponentially increasing volume of digital materials and associated new tasks, while exciting, can seem overwhelming. Table 2.1 provides examples of activities that have been added to the portfolio of the traditional institutional archives over the past five decades.

Table 2.1. Examples of multiplying areas of archival engagement over the past fifty years

Activity	1970s	1980s	1990s	2000s	2010s
Advocating for archives, explaining what they do and why they should matter in their lives	X	X	X	X	X
Identifying specifications for digital recordkeeping systems		X	X	X	X
Disposition scheduling of paper records	X	X	X	X	X
Disposition scheduling of machine-readable/electronic/digital records	X	X	X	X	X
Appraising paper records	X	X	X	X	X
Appraising machine-readable/electronic/digital records	X	X	X	X	X
Selecting "manuscript" materials, e.g., photographs, personal papers, literary manuscript drafts, audiovisual materials	X	X	X	X	X
Identifying and acquiring digital "manuscript" materials, e.g., social media, personal web pages, digital video				X	X
Developing strategies and programs for increasing documentation of underdocumented groups and phenomena		X	X	X	X
Preserving traditional media	X	X	X	X	X
Preserving analog sound and visual media	X	X	X	X	X
Preserving electronic records and other born-digital media	X	X	X	X	X
Preserving and curating digitized archival materials			X	X	X
Arranging and describing traditional materials	X	X	X	X	X
Arranging and describing analog sound and visual materials	X	X	X	X	X

[Arranging and] describing electronic/digital materials	X	X	X	X	X
Staying abreast of changing metadata schemes and mappings and associated descriptive software and updating all descriptions			X	X	X
Selecting nondigital materials for digitization			X	X	X
Digitizing and describing at the item or within-item level, mounting digitized materials online, and integrating them into other online resources			X	X	X
Providing physical reference services	X	X	X	X	X
Providing digital reference services			X	X	X
Managing and ensuring the continued trustworthiness of digital and digitized holdings and all the associated metadata, including assuring compliance for those stored in the cloud	X	X	X	X	X
Identifying how to use new developments like social networking to document or support the activities of communities that were previously absent or underdocumented in the archives, and to support archival outreach				X	X
Lobbying against unduly restrictive records closures and copyright protections, while also protecting the needs and interests of affected individuals and communities	X	X	X	X	X
Ensuring that archives support human rights concerns related to recordkeeping and records accessibility	X	X	X	X	X
Accommodating changing needs, communication modes, and methodological practices of existing archival users		X	X	X	X
Reaching out to potential nontraditional and often unseen users of archives globally and accommodating their modalities, motivations, competencies, languages, and worldviews			X	X	X
Partnering with diverse communities on the development of community archives and archival protocols, and on digital repatriation activities			X	X	X
Engaging in practice and community-based research to learn how to do all of the above more effectively			X	X	X

Practically speaking, archives need to find ways to integrate, in an organic and effective manner, born-digital as well as digitized archival content and to rethink records creation, information retrieval, and end-user services within a comprehensive archival regime, as well as within a

plural and glocal world. Definitions, practices, and workflow for managing nondigital materials will need to be rethought to address a host of emergent questions. For example, when it comes to working with digital records or building digital archives, who or what is in the driver's seat? Is it archivists, technological advances, external funding priorities, current events, policy requirements, intellectual movements, or the various and shifting needs of users? Which archival approaches continue to work in the digital age, which need to be enhanced, and which might even be abandoned? How might archival notions of the record, evidence, fixity, permanence, uniqueness, authenticity, ownership, and custody be shifting? Who should or will be the archivist (for example, do self-archiving or corporately administered archival escrow services for digital materials have appropriate and viable roles)? Should the academic scientist, archaeologist, anthropologist, or ethnomusicologist, to name but a few, who gathers the documentation as part of his or her own research take on responsibility also for archiving it, and, if so, under what preservation and access conditions and ethical regimes? What might developments such as self-archiving services mean for the trust we place in the archived record? Can archives be kept in the same digital repository as research data and bibliographic materials? If so, according to what kind of management regime? How much of our digital heritage should actually be preserved? If we were able to preserve it all, should we? On what basis should we make those decisions? How can archives protect the interests of the individual associated with a record when that record, and many more related to it, go online?³⁵ Are there profession-specific practices or approaches that information and memory institutions such as libraries, museums, and archives can learn from or share, especially in the areas of metadata creation, content curation, and programming for users?³⁶ What economic and policy structures might best support the long-term development and ongoing management of digital archives?

Conclusion

This book cannot possibly answer all of these questions, but they indicate the kind of reflexivity and knowledge of prior experiences and strategies with which the twenty-first-century archivist must be equipped.

Indubitably, new forms of cooperation between archival repositories and, more broadly, across information and memory professions and the public and private sector, are needed, but new ways of thinking about what often turn out to be old or pre-existing questions and challenges are also necessary.

The archives of the digital age, which are also the archives of today, know no media limitations and are quite able to transcend their physical housing. They are also society's continuity with its past. As in Samaran's day, archives hold the ancient, the precious, the official, the historical, and the authentic. But, increasingly, they are also enabled to capture and make available the unofficial, the social, the personal, the ethnographic, and the witnessing that undergird rights, obligations, and memory of all people in all places.

Digital developments allow archives to span time and space in new ways. Virtual archives and archival services offer users, both local and remote, more granular and customized access, even if, at present, to less content, than can the physical archive and its services. The Internet is a vehicle that the archive can use to capture more and more candid materials created through digital communications and the World Wide Web, as well as to support shared responsibility for documenting and collecting, for federating collections online, and for opening up the archive for a variety of types of use and user interactions.

For all of these exciting developments, however, archivists still need to understand where there is continuity with, and where change is needed in, traditional practices. Even more important, as new activities are layered on top of existing backlogs, archivists must figure out how to balance day-to-day responsibilities with their overarching responsibility as the profession of the record to that record, to society, and to all of humanity whose lives are somehow caught up in that record.

Notes

Portions of this chapter were previously presented in a keynote speech, "The Construction of the Archive and the Representation of Alternative Pasts," at the Summer School on Memory, Power and the Alternative Pasts, Helsinki, Finland, May 2011; and at the Summer School for Old Books, University of Zadar, September 2009.

- ¹ Subject Files of Solon J. Buck Relating to Archival Principles, Practices and Institutions, 1789–1956, Box 1, RG 64 Records of the United States National Archives and Records Administration, National Archives and Records Administration.
- ² See, for example, John Bunyan, *The Pilgrim's Progress* (London, 1684); Arthur Conan Doyle, *The Maracot Deep* (London, 1929); Sylvia Townsend Warner, *Kingdoms of Elfin* (London, 1972); and José Saramago, *All the Names* (London: Harcourt, 1999).
- ³ James P. Sickinger, *Public Records and Archives in Classical Athens* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1999); Diskin Clay, "Epicurus in the Archives of Athens," in *Studies in Attic Epigraphy, History and Topography*, Hesperia Supplement 9 (Princeton, N.J.: American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 1982), 17–26.
- ⁴ Luciana Duranti, "Archives as a Place," *Archives and Manuscripts* 24, no. 2 (1996): 242–55. Republished in *Archives and Social Studies: A Journal of Interdisciplinary Research* 1, no. 1 (2007), Archivo Municipal Cartagena, <http://tinyurl.com/2dbasvb>.
- ⁵ Maria Portuondo, *Secret Science: Spanish Cosmography and the New World* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2009).
- ⁶ Thomas Richards, *The Imperial Archive: Knowledge and the Fantasy of Empire* (New York: Verso, 1993), 3–4.
- ⁷ Ann Laura Stoler, *Along the Archival Grain: Epistemic Anxieties and Colonial Common Sense* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2009), 20.
- ⁸ Mark Twain, *Following the Equator: A Journey around the World* (Hartford: American Publishing Company, 1897), 699.
- ⁹ See, for example, Michel Foucault, *The Archaeology of Knowledge and the Discourse on Language* (New York: Pantheon, 1972).
- ¹⁰ See, for example, Jacques Derrida, *Archive Fever: A Freudian Impression*, trans. Eric Prenowitz (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996).
- ¹¹ See, for example, Pierre Bourdieu, *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgment of Taste*, trans. Richard Nice (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2000).
- ¹² See, for example, Jean-François Lyotard, *La Condition Postmoderne: Rapport sur le Savoir* [The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge] (Paris: Editions de Minuit, c. 1979).
- ¹³ See, for example, Linda Tuhiwai Smith, *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples* (London: Zed Books, 1999).
- ¹⁴ For example, the theme for the MINOM-ICOM International Movement for a New Museology 14th Annual Conference held in Cape Verde in October 2011 was to reflect on "Altermuseology with those who seek a world with justice and solidarity far beyond the perspective of cooperation between rich and poor, which has marked relations between north and south," <http://www.minom-icom.net/>.
- ¹⁵ Paul Connerton, *How Societies Remember* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989).
- ¹⁶ Diana Taylor, *The Archive and the Repertoire: Performing Cultural Memory in the Americas* (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 2003).
- ¹⁷ Simon Schama, *Landscapes and Memory* (New York: Vintage Books, 1995).

- ¹⁸ Pierre Nora, *Rethinking France: Les Lieux de Mémoire*, vol. 1, trans. David P. Jordan (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001).
- ¹⁹ Steve Jones, *Virtual Culture: Identity and Communication in Cybersociety* (Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage Publications, 1997).
- ²⁰ Deborah A. Turner, *Conceptualizing Oral Documents* (PhD diss., University of Washington, 2009).
- ²¹ Shannon Faulkhead, *Narratives of Koorie Victoria* (PhD diss., Monash University, 2009).
- ²² See, for example, AERI PACG, "Educating for the Archival Multiverse," 68–102 (see chapter 1, n. 47); McKemmish et al., "Communities of Memory," 146–75 (see introduction, n. 31); Frank Upward, Sue McKemmish, and Barbara Reed, "Archivists and Changing Social and Information Spaces: A Continuum Approach to Recordkeeping and Archiving in Online Cultures," *Archivaria* 72 (Fall 2011): 197–238.
- ²³ Terry Cook, "What Is Past Is Prologue: A History of Archival Ideas Since 1898, and the Future Paradigm Shift," *Archivaria* 43 (Spring 1997).
- ²⁴ Eric Ketelaar, "Archival Temples, Archival Prisons: Modes of Power and Protection," *Archival Science* 2, nos. 3–4 (2002).
- ²⁵ The Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002, Pub. L. No. 107-204, 116 Stat. 745, also known as the Public Company Accounting Reform and Investor Protection Act of 2002.
- ²⁶ Menand describes such pluralism as "an attempt to make a good out of the circumstance that goods are often incommensurable. People come at life from different places, they understand the world in different ways, they strive for different ends. This is a fact that has proved amazingly hard to live with, and the reason is that as associated beings, we naturally seek to find our tastes, values, and hopes reflected in other people. It would be one thing, in other words, if each individual simply had his or her own spin and there were no way to get groups of people spinning in the same direction. But individuals do belong to groups, they take their identities from groups, and it tends to be as members of groups that they pursue the goods they desire. To the extent that one group perceives its goods as incompatible with the goods of another group, there are collisions." Louis Menand, *The Metaphysical Club: A Story of Ideas in America* (New York: Farrar, Strauss, Giroux, 2001), 377.
- ²⁷ For example, Svärd and Sundqvist discuss the challenges of disseminating information on the TRC findings in Sierra Leone using information and communication technologies (ICTs). They find, however, that lack of access to ICTs as well as of information skills impeded the ability of women and children in that country to empower themselves and hindered sustainable development. They cite the Sierra Leonean TRC Act as calling for the commission "to create an impartial historical record of violations and abuses of human rights and international humanitarian law related to the armed conflict in Sierra Leone from the beginning of the conflict in 1991 to the signing of the Lomé Peace Agreement, to address impunity, to respond to the needs of the victims, to promote healing and reconciliation and to prevent a repetition of the violations and abuses suffered." Proscovia Svärd and Anneli Sundqvist, "IT, the Most Revolutionary Issue Globally: But Is It for All?," *INFOtrend: Nordic Journal for Information Specialists* 62, no. 3 (1997): 71–78.
- ²⁸ For example, after an appeal to researchers who had made copies of their materials, it was possible to reconstruct virtually, at least in part, the unique holdings of the National and University Library in Sarajevo, which were destroyed by war during the 1990s. "Activist" archivists in South Africa, South America, and elsewhere, seek out and then describe or digitize and make available online archival evidence in the form of hidden records and personal testimonies relating to the persecuted and the disappeared to provide a counterpoint to the official record. See the South African History Archive, http://www.saha.org.za/about_saha.htm.
- ²⁹ Elizabeth Crooke, "The Politics of Community Heritage: Motivations, Authority and Control," *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 16 (January–March 2010): 16–29; Dominique Daniel, "Documenting the Immigrant and Ethnic Experience in American Archives," *The American Archivist* 73 (Spring/Summer 2010): 82–104; Flinn et al., "Whose Memories, Whose Archives?," 71–86 (see

chapter 1, n. 28); Mary Stevens, Andrew Flinn, and Elizabeth Shepherd, "New Frameworks for Community Engagement in the Archives Sector: From Handing Over to Handing On," *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 16 (January–March 2010): 59–76; Andrew Flinn, "Independent Community Archives and Community-Generated Content: 'Writing, Saving and Sharing our Histories,'" *Convergence: The International Journal of Research into New Media Technologies* 16, no. 1 (2010): 39–51; Helen Klæbe and Marcus Foth, "Capturing Community Memory with Oral History and New Media: The Sharing Stories Project," in *3rd International Conference of the Community Informatics Research Network (CIRN)*, ed. Larry Stillman and Graeme Johanson, October 9–11, Prato, Italy, <http://eprints.qut.edu.au/4751/>; Horacio Roque Ramirez, "A Living Archive of Desire: Teresita la Campesina and the Embodiment of Queer Latino Community Histories," in *Archive Stories: Facts, Fictions, and the Writing of History*, ed. Antoinette Burton (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 2005), 111–35; Joel Wurl, "Ethnicity as Provenance: In Search of Values and Principles for Documenting the Immigrant Experience," *Archival Issues* 29, no. 1 (2005): 65–76; and Lynette Russell, "Indigenous Records and Archives: Mutual Obligations and Building Trust," *Archives and Manuscripts* 34, no. 1 (2006): 32–43.

³⁰ "Koorie" is the term that many Indigenous Australians use to refer to themselves.

³¹ See Koorie Heritage Trust, "Collections," <http://www.koorieheritagetrust.com/collections/>; see also Monash University, "Trust and Technology Project," <http://www.infotech.monash.edu.au/research/centres/cosi/projects/trust/>.

³² An increasingly over-used yet nuanced term, "community," as used here, refers to any kind of group, whether special interest, regional, ethnic, racial, or gender-based, that has archival needs and materials, but that functions outside the parameters of traditional or mainstream institutional environments.

³³ For example, Rick Prelinger, collector of the Prelinger Archives of sixty thousand advertising, educational, industrial, and amateur films; or public participation in the Home Movie Day initiative, "More About Home Movie Day," <http://www.homemovieday.com/about.html>.

³⁴ Of course, on the grandest scale, there is Brewster Kahle and the Internet Archive and its Wayback Machine, <http://www.archive.org/>.

³⁵ Italian journalist and novelist Italo Calvino once wrote that "biographical data, even those recorded in the public registers, are the most private things one has, and to declare them openly is rather like facing a psychoanalyst." Italo Calvino, *The Literature Machine* (London: Vintage, 1997), 339.

³⁶ For some examples, see Gilliland-Swetland, *Enduring Paradigms* (see chapter 1, n. 5); Anne J. Gilliland-Swetland, Layna White, and Robin L. Chandler, "We're Building It, Will They Use It? The MOAC II Evaluation Project," in *Proceedings of Museums and the Web 2004, Arlington, Virginia, March 31–April 3, 2004*, <http://www.archimuse.com/mw2004/papers/g-swetland/g-swetland.html>; Layna White and Anne J. Gilliland-Swetland, "Museum Information Professionals as Users and Providers of Online Resources: Museums and the Online Archive of California II Study," *ASIST Bulletin* (June/July 2004): 23–26.

CHAPTER 3



The Quest to Integrate the World's Knowledge: American Archival Engagement with the Documentation Movement, 1900–1950

The International Congress of Libraries and Archives held in Brussels in 1910 is widely regarded as a seminal moment in the development of information science. Yet, its centrality to the development of archival science as well as the national and international interactions between archivists and the documentation movement out of which information science was to grow are less appreciated. This chapter explores these early interactions and why they were abandoned. It also establishes historical context for documentary and metadata ideas central to much of the subsequent discourse regarding archival descriptive standards and archival automation, digital libraries and archives development, cyberinfrastructure-building, and, most recently, community-based archives and digital curation.

The story of American archives—is one to craze the historians, to amaze the layman, and to leave the law-maker unconcerned as ever. . . . This country, which has so completely out-distanced other countries in the development of Library Science, is immeasurably behind them in all that pertains to archives. In general our archives are neglected if not completely ignored.

—Waldo Gifford Leland, 1912¹

CONCEPTUALIZING 21ST-CENTURY ARCHIVES

ANNE J. GILLILAND



SOCIETY OF
American
Archivists

CHICAGO

Table of Contents

PREFACE	viii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	xi
CHAPTER 1. Introduction	1
The Archival Role in Digital Timespace.	1
Thinking and Acting “Glocally”	4
The Evolving Archival Paradigm.	6
Some Resonating Emergent Constructs	11
<i>Archives as a Place and Post-custodial Approaches</i>	12
<i>Archivization and Archivalization</i>	16
<i>Communities of Memory and of Records</i>	17
<i>Community Archives</i>	18
<i>Co-creatorship</i>	29
<i>Digital Repatriation</i>	30
<i>The Archival Multiverse</i>	32
CHAPTER 2. Reframing the Archive in a Digital Age: Balancing Continuity with Innovation and Responsibility with Responsibilities	37
Archives, Power, and Politics	38
Archives, Pluralism, and Activism	43
Archives and Human Rights	44
Building Digital Archives	45
Conclusion	50

Society of American Archivists
www.archivists.org

© 2014 by the Society of American Archivists.
All rights reserved.

Printed in the United States of America.

Cover design by Paula Ashley, Next Year's News, <http://www.nyninc.com/>.
Interior graphic design by Sweeney Design, kasween@shcglobal.net.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Gilliland, Anne.
Conceptualizing 21st-century archives / Anne J. Gilliland.
pages cm

Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 978-1-931666-68-8

1. Archives—Technological innovations—History. 2. Archives—Automation—History. I. Title.
CD973.D3G45 2014
025.17'140285—dc23